

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART Note Note of the ACM MUDARDS 1964 A Software Data Base Development Volume I



ANDREW C. NAJBERG

The Analytic Sciences Corporation One Jacob Way Reading, Massachusetts 01867

25 June 1984



APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

Prepared For

ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
DEPUTY COMPTROLLER
HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS 01731

LEGAL NOTICE

When U.S. Government drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related government procurement operation, the government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

OTHER NOTICES

Do not return this copy. Retain or destroy.

" THIS TECHNICAL REPORT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND IS APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION."

JOSEPH P. DEAN, Capt, USAF Senior Software Cost-Research Analyst Directorate of Cost Comptroller

- Company of the comp

ELLEN M. COAKLEY Technical Director of Cost Comptroller

FOR THE COMMANDER

DAVID G. KANTER, Colonel, USAF

Comptroller

Un	_ 1	_	_	_	÷	£	4	_	4
un	· · · · ·	·a		3	1	1	1	-	u

			V OF THIS	

	Jan Carlott G		REPORT DOCUM	MENTATION	PAGE			
1a. REPORT SE	CURITY CLASS	IFICATION		16. RESTRICTIVE	MARKINGS			
Unclassif								
2a SECURITY	CLASSIFICATIO	N AUTHORITY		8	I AVAILABILITY OF			
2b. DECLASSIF	ICATION / DOW	NGRADING SCHEDU	JLE	Approved Unlimite	l for Public 1 ≀d	Kele	ase; Di	stribution
4 PERFORMIN	G ORGANIZAT	ION REPORT NUMB	ER(S)	5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION REP	ORT	NUMBER(S)	
TR-4612-5	5-1			ESD-TR-8	37-166			
		ORGANIZATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL	7a. NAME OF M	ONITORING ORGANI	ZATIO	ON.	
The Analy	ytic Scier	nces Corp.	(If applicable)	ELECT	TRONIC SYSTEMS	S DI	VISION	(ACCR)
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and	d ZIP Code)		76 ADDRESS (Ci	ty, State, and ZIP Co	ode)		
One Jacol	b Way			Hanscom	AFB			1
Reading,	Massachus	setts 01867		Massachı	isetts, 01731	-500	0	
	FUNDING/SPO	NSORING	8b OFFICE SYMBOL	9 PROCUREMEN	T INSTRUMENT IDEN	NTIFIC	ATION NUI	MBER
ORGANIZA			(If applicable)					
Deputy Cor			ESD/ACCR		82-D-0253/001			
Banscom A	City, State, and FR	I ZIP Code)			FUNDING NUMBERS			<u> </u>
Massachus		31-5000		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.		TASK NO		WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
	•			j]]
11 TITLE (Incl.	-				· 			
Software :	Data Base	Development	Volume I					
12 PERSONAL Andrew C		ro						}
13a TYPE OF		13b. TIME C	OVERED	14 DATE OF REPO	ORT (Year, Month, Da	ועפ	15 PAGE	COUNT
Technical		FROM	то	1984 June		-" .	114	
16 SUPPLEME	NTARY NOTA	TION						
į								ł
17	COSATI	CODES	19 SUBJECT TERMS //	Continue on sour		i ala a a i	6. hi. blad	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	18 SUBJECT TERMS (ontinue on reven	se it necessary and	identi	ry by bioci	c number)
			Software	Data Colle	ction			
			1					
19 ABSTRACT	(Continue on	reverse if necessary	and identify by block r	number)				
dologio	rument id	dentifies t	he data eleme	nts that n	eed to be o	coll	lected	and metho-
rious da	tacolla	usea when a action form	eveloping a Seats that can	ottware Co	est Database) . !	It pro	esents va~
tities t	he vario	ous DIDs th	at should be	ne useu 10 modified t	o enhanco t	rect the	.ion. .softw:	it iden-
collecti	on effoi	rt. It als	o maps the va	rious data	elements f	tron	n the	data col-
Lection	formats	to several	existing sof	tware mode	ls includir	ng (тосомо	, PRICE-S,
SLIM and	l JS II.			•				·
1								
ł								
[
ď								
ļ								
30 000000	*1041.4			<u> </u>				
		BILITY OF ABSTRACT		1	ECURITY CLASSIFICA	TION		
	F RESPONSIBLE		RPT DTIC USERS			1220	OFFICE SV	MROL
Joseph De	ean, Capta	in, USAF		(617) 377-	(Include Area Code) 2679	L.E	SD/ACCR	500

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page	
1.	1.1 1.2	DUCTION Purpose General Approach Keport Organization	1-1 1-2 1-3 1-4	
2.	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4	BASE REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS Existing Data Bases Software Cost Model Data Requirements Software Productivity and Quality Metrics Data Base Contents 2.4.1 System Description and Characteristics 2.4.2 Development Schedule Data 2.4.3 Hardware Characteristics and Constraints 2.4.4 Development Resources and Constraints 2.4.5 Software Size and Characteristics 2.4.6 Resource Expenditure Data Work Breakdown Structure Data Base Structure	2-1 2-2 2-3 2-4 2-5 2-6 2-8 2-8 2-9 2-10 2-11 2-12 2-15	
3.	3.1	COLLECTION METHODOLOGY Collection Formats 3.1.1 Software Development Project Summary Data 3.1.2 Computer Hardware Detail Data 3.1.3 CPCI Summary Data 3.1.4 Resource Expenditure Data 3.1.5 CPCI Function and Sizing Data Detail 3.1.6 Data Collection Format Instructions Collection Approaches Data Base Maintenance and Growth 3.3.1 Data Collection Methodology 3.3.2 Additional Data Sources	3-1 3-1 3-2 3-4 3-5 3-7 3-8 3-10 3-11 3-13 3-13 3-13	
4.		NCING THE STATE-OF-THE-ART OF SOFTWARE ESTIMATING Data Base Automation Cost Model Validation and Calibration	4-1 4-1 4-2	<u></u>






TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
4.3 ESD-Unique Model Development 4.4 Software Sizing Methodology 4.5 Software Maintenance Cost Model	4-3 4-4 4-5
5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5-1
APPENDIX A SOFTWARE COST MODEL/DATA COLLECTION FORMAT CROSS REFERENCE TABLES	A-1
APPENDIX B DATA COLLECTION PACKAGE	B - 1
REFERENCES	R - 1

ANSON ECONOMI ELECTRO (CONTROL MANAGES) PROPERTING (CONTROL MANAGES)

INTRODUCTION

1.

PESSESSE BESSESSE BESSESSE REFERENCE

14.10 Periodicia (14.14.14.14.16.16)

The increasing contribution of software development and maintenance costs to the overall life-cycle cost of DoD weapon systems has been well documented in recent years. In particular, software life-cycle costs are predicted to be in excess of 80% of total computer hardware/software system lifecycle cost and in excess of 50% of the total system costs by the end of the decade (Ref. 1). This situation reflects the decreasing costs of computer hardware and the expanded use of embedded computers in DoD systems because of their functional Recognition of this accelerating shift of cost capability. drivers from hardware to software has resulted in significantly more attention being given to methods of deriving estimates of the resources that will be expended on the software subsystems. Therefore, a method of estimating software cost and schedule requirements with a reasonable confidence level is required to enhance existing management tools.

There currently exist several software cost estimating systems and models which have gained some degree of acceptance within the software cost estimating community. The most commonly used of these are SLIM (Ref. 2), JS-1 (Ref. 3), PRICE-S (Ref. 4), and COCOMO (Ref. 5). However, before any of these models can be used to develop a software cost estimate, they should be validated for use for a particular class of applications. Moreover, if validated, these models must then be calibrated for a particular development environment. A data base which is representative of Air Force Electronic Systems Division (ESD) software development is necessary to make these models useful.

An alternative to the use of the existing software cost models is the development of a unique model which is specifically tailored to the ESD development environment and product characteristics. This approach can overcome several shortcomings of the existing models, in particular, the lack of a:

- Valid method for estimating the cost of software modification or maintenance
- Valid technique for timephasing manpower requirements when resource constraints exist
- Statistical basis for establishing confidence intervals for an estimate
- Capability to estimate software size.

Development of this unique model requires a comprehensive data base which contains software characteristics and parameters for development projects that reflect the development environment and applications of ESD.

1.1 PURPOSE

The main objective of this effort is to develop a software cost data base which can support the cost estimating process. The ability to use the data base for validation and calibration of the COCOMO, SLIM, JS-1, and PRICE-S software cost models is a major consideration. Since the state-of-the-art of software cost estimating is advancing, the data base must also be flexible enough to be used for model development or enhancement. Finally, the data base should support development of software sizing tools because size is the key input to most software models. Figure 1.1-1 depicts a multipurpose software cost data base.

A 2904




Figure 1.1-1 Software Cost Data Base Implementation

In addition to defining a software cost data base, this effort includes the design of data collection formats, the development and implementation of an approach for the initial data collection, and the establishment of a methodology for maintenance and growth of the data o se in the future. Recommendations for future uses of the data base and approaches for advancing the state-of-the-art of software cost estimation are also part of this effort.

1.2 GENERAL APPROACH

The data base design is the result of discussions with government and industry personnel involved in the soft-ware development process as either software engineers, cost estimators or data base developers. It was further refined by using information from surveys of reports on previous data collection and data base development efforts, by review of the

user documentation for numerous software cost estimating models, and by analysis of prior software productivity, quality and reliability metrics research.

A standard software work breakdown structure (WBS) was defined and is used for the data base structure. The selected structure is based on an analysis of historical WBSs used at ESD, other structures proposed by industry and a comparison with WBS practices for hardware.

Based on the results of this research, data collection formats were then developed and distributed to potential participants. Analysis of the feedback from the participants and the completed data collection formats were used to refine the data collection package.

Finally, the software cost estimation requirements of ESD were analyzed to determine what enhancements were needed to improve the current capability.

1.3 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report consists of two volumes: Volume I - a report on the data base designs and data collection methodology; Volume II - a compilation of the data collected. The following describes the contents of Volume I.

Chapter 2 of this report details the research performed to determine the data base contents and describes the elements that are included, as well as the structure of the data base. In Chapter 3 the development and implementation of the data collection formats and methodology are discussed and evaluated;

recommendations for growth of the data base are also made. Chapter 4 details future efforts that should be undertaken to continue improving the state-of-the-art of software cost estimation. A summary of the study results and recommendations is presented in Chapter 5. Appendix A contains cross reference tables between the cost model input parameters and data collection formats. The final version of the data collection package is contained in Appendix B.

DATA BASE REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS

2.

The software development process represents the complex interaction of requirements and resources to produce a software product. Figure 2-1 depicts some of the major categories of factors which affect the outcome of this process. The software data base must contain the data elements necessary to measure and evaluate the impact of these factors.

The contents and structure of the data base were determined through an analysis of the data reporting practices used and the data bases maintained by organizations within government and industry. Of particular interest were those software data bases whose objective was to support cost estimating or to

A 11100




Figure 2-1 Factors Affecting Software Cost

evaluate software productivity. Likewise, the data requirements for use and calibration of the major software cost models in use today were reviewed. Finally, additional research was performed in the area of software productivity and quality metrics to evaluate alternatives to the current methods of software cost estimation.

2.1 EXISTING DATA BASES

Currently, software data bases fall into two categories: those that contain summary data at the system level and those that contain detail data at the lowest level to which software can be logically subdivided. To a great extent the amount of detail is determined not by the requirements of the data base developer, but by the availability of the data. The most detailed data bases exist within the development organizations which have a direct influence on the type of data collected for the day-to-day management of a development effort. Therefore, government software development organizations, such as the NASA Software Engineering Laboratory, and defense contractors historically have the best data available. On the other hand, data availability at government program offices is limited by the existing data items used for reporting software technical and resource utilization data.

Over the past few years the Data and Analysis Center for Software (DACS), the National Security Agency (NSA), and ESD, among others, have endeavored to develop new data items and reporting methods to obtain software data with sufficient detail to support the cost estimating process and to develop better estimating tools. The ESD efforts have resulted in the development of the Software Acquisition Resource Expenditure (SARE) Data Collection Methodology, which was completed in

December 1983 (Ref. 6). Both DACS and NSA are evaluating SARE to determine its applicability to their data needs.

In order to capitalize on the effort expended in the development of SARE, this project used SARE as the starting point for the data base requirements analysis. Additions have been made to the specific elements collected to provide information for definitive classification of the system and its Computer Program Configuration Items (CPCIs) and to provide cross checks for other data entries. On the other hand, some of the detail required by SARE has been eliminated because it is not practical to collect. For example, no data are collected at the Computer Program Component level with the exception of function and sizing data if that is the lowest level at which these data are available. Additionally, parameters which cannot be reasonably determined outside of the development organization at the time when an estimate is being prepared were also deleted.

2.2 SOFTWARE COST MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS

A thorough review of the documentation for the major software cost models in use today (Refs. 2 through 5 and 7 through 14) resulted in the tabulation of the common elements among them. Appendix A contains cross reference tables showing the relationship between the data requirements for the COCOMO, JS-1, SLIM, and PRICE-S models and the data items on the data collection formats. For those items which were subjective in nature, the guidelines for making the value judgement were reviewed to identify any objective factors or characteristics that could be used to make the proper determination. This was not feasible in all cases, e.g., the complexity factor used by COCOMO has extensive guidelines which would require an inordinate number of numerical statistics to replace the subjective

determination which would be made by a software engineer familiar with the project. Whenever there was an overlap among the models, data representing the lowest common denominator and with the greatest level of granularity were included in the data base.

には、10mmには、10mmに対象のでは、10mmに対象が対象ができ、10mmに対象のでは、10mmに対象のでは、10mmに対象のでは、10mmに対象が対象ができません。

In areas where ambiguity may exist even with extensive data entry guidelines, data elements on which the ambiguous parameter would be based were also included in the data base to provide consistency checks. For example, an assessment of the CPU memory constraint as a percent utilization of the total available memory does not necessarily indicate a true memory constraint. Therefore, information about the expansion capability of the target computer and the reserve memory requirements is also included.

2.3 SOFTWARE PRODUCTIVITY AND QUALITY METRICS

The use of lines of code as a measurement of software productivity yields a wide range of results depending on the project. Although alternatives to lines of code have been proposed over the years, it appears that lines of code will remain the standard for cost estimation purposes. Many of the alternative approaches (Refs. 15 through 24) require the measurement of parameters that can only be determined after the completion of the software development effort, such as weighted statement count and process (a measure of the number of data items and paths in a program). Still others are highly correlated to lines of code, for example, number of modules. In general, the research performed on software productivity measurement indicates that, for cost estimation, lines of code is the most promising metric when used in combination with qualitative information.

Therefore, when lines of delivered source code are used as the primary metric, the variation in productivity from one project to another must be accounted for by qualifying the amount of code written using additional productivity metrics and by the addition of quality metrics. Many productivity metrics are nonquantitative, such as functions performed, development constraints, and personnel quality. These can be used strictly as qualitative metrics for categorization of development projects into homogeneous groupings. Alternatively, they can be quantified using a relative scale, as has been done in the COCOMO and JS-1 models, with detailed qualitative guidelines for selecting a numeric value. The same factors apply to quality metrics, such as reliability, maintainability, or completeness.

Both approaches are valid and should be used in conjunction with one another. To the extent that a sufficiently large data base exists, the available estimation models should be calibrated using the most narrowly defined grouping of projects possible. The development of new models should also be based on the most homogeneous grouping of projects that can be selected through the use of productivity and quality metrics and still contain sufficient data points to be statistically valid.

This data base is designed to include the metrics themselves, based on a definitive set of guidelines, or the lower level data elements required to derive the metrics.

2.4 DATA BASE CONTENTS

The data base can be logically divided into six distinct categories:

- System description and characteristics
- Development schedule data

- Hardware characteristics and constraints
- Development resources and constraints
- Software size and characteristics
- Resource expenditure data.

The data within each of these categories consist of the elements required to classify the system, to define the development environment, and to derive the software development cost drivers and input parameters for software cost and sizing models.

2.4.1 System Description and Characteristics

A key element of any data base design is the development of a classification scheme that can be used to group data for analysis and for data retrieval. The development of a comprehensive list of keywords based on the descriptions of a weapon system at the total system level is essential for matching a new system against those historical data which are most appropriate for model calibration. By extending this technique to the software segment of the system, to the CPCI level, and on down to the module level, a more restrictive selection can be made as the new system is defined in greater detail. Figure 2.4-1 shows the elements used for this progressive classification of a system.

Descriptive data defining the mission of the system, the hardware interfaces, the functions performed by the system as a whole and by the lower level components of the system are included in this data base so that keywords for data retrieval and classification can be developed. As the number of projects

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

MISSION DESCRIPTION

HARDWARE INTERFACES

SYSTEM FUNCTIONS

- SOFTWARE FUNCTIONS
- TARGET COMPUTER CHARACTERISTICS



COMPUTER PROGRAM CONFIGURATION ITEM

- FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION
- DEVELOPMENT PERSONNEL QUALITY
- SIZE PROFILE BY OPERATION OPERATIONAL RESPONSE REQUIREMENT
- SOURCE STATEMENT TYPE MIX
- DISPLAY REQUIREMENT

PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE

• TARGET COMPUTER CHARACTERISTICS



MODULE OR UNIT

FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY

PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE

Figure 2.4-1 Software Classification Hierarchy

documented in the data base increases, some of the other data categories, such as hardware constraints, can also be used to further restrict data selection or to provide a more homogeneous grouping.

2.4.2 Development Schedule Data

Schedule data are collected by major development milestone at the system level and for each CPCL in the system.

These milestones define the schedule to a level of detail sufficient to segment the effort into the major phases of the software life cycle, from project start to the start of the maintenance phase. These data, in conjunction with the monthly resource expenditure data, are used to determine the relative effort expended for each phase of the development. Both the original schedule dates, as well as the actual or estimated milestone completion dates, are included so that an assessment can be made of the degree of schedule acceleration. A subjective rating of the perceived schedule acceleration or stretchout is also included to determine its impact on the development.

2.4.3 Hardware Characteristics and Constraints

Information about the target computer is necessary to determine the timing and sizing constraints under which the software is being developed. Central processing unit (CPU) memory and timing utilization data are specified with supplemental information indicating the use of extraordinary measures to reduce size and the amount of software which is time constrained. Additional data about the expansion capability of the hardware, the reserve memory and time requirements are also included to determine whether the constraints indicated are real or perceived.

To allow for the grouping of software developments by class of target computer, especially for standard architectures, the computer used is specifically identified and the maturity of the hardware and the virtual machine is assessed. Instances of concurrent hardware and software development are indicated.

2.4.4 Development Resources and Constraints

There is a general consensus that the development environment and personnel factors are major contributors to the variation in productivity among software developments. This data base is designed to characterize the major components of the development environment which impact software cost.

The tools and methods available within the development organization are identified at the system level and their usage is rated for each CPCI. The characteristics of the development computer are compared with those of the target computer. Since access to the computer resource has a direct impact on productivity, the availability of the computer, as well as the access mode and computer location, are specified.

In the area of hardware cost estimation, it has been accepted practice to apply an improvement curve to the production of multiple units of an item. Although a direct analogy cannot be made for applying an improvement curve to software development, the experience of the development personnel in the weapon system application and with the development tools and techniques used will impact the overall productivity on a project. While software developers are involved in the familiarization process with the development environment, the design and code produced are often less than optimal and result in increased failure rates and redesign effort. Therefore, information about the experience of the personnel assigned at the start of the project is captured in the data base.

In addition to the effects of personnel quality on the costs of a project, the availability of personnel will likewise affect the schedule and manloading profiles for a project. Although these data are not a direct input into any of the models, they can be used to analyze calibration results, in particular for SLIM which uses project duration, as well as development manpower, in the calibration process with the assumption that manloading is unconstrained.

2.4.5 Software Size and Characteristics

The type of software size data included in the data base is driven by two requirements:

- The need for size data at the CPCI level with allocations to various functional characteristics, processing modes, and languages to support the specific requirements of several cost models
- The need for size decomposition to the lowest level available with functional categorization and language identification to support sizing by analogy requirements.

The model-specific allocation data at the CPCI level, such as source statement mix, can also be used to group CPCIs into homogeneous groupings for model calibration and model development research. The lower level of functional detail provides data for in-depth analysis of variations in productivity or calibration results among a group of programs that appear to be homogeneous at the CPCI level.

To further clarify the magnitude of the development task, additional data about the amount of reuseable or modified code is required. This element will be particularly useful for evaluating the impact that Ada will have in this area.

2.4.6 Resource Expenditure Data

Ordinarily, cost data are obtained in terms of dollars. However, there are many problems inherent in that approach. First of all, the data must be normalized to a common base year to eliminate the distortion which is caused by inflation and to make data from different time frames comparable. Next, the effects of different labor rates due to the geographic locations of the developers must be accounted for in the data. Finally, the data must be normalized for the impact of different overhead rates and charging practices for other direct costs. This normalization process is very intricate and would require the collection of additional data elements, such as labor and overhead rates. In many instances, these data are proprietary to a particular company and difficult to obtain because they are competitive sensitive.

Most data normalization problems are avoided when the cost data are collected in terms of manpower. The only adjustment required in this case is the conversion of the data to a common unit of manpower measurement, such as manmonths composed of a specific number of manhours. The labor content of the manpower is evaluated to insure that the data for all projects represent the same types of activities, for example, designers and programmers, but not clerical support.

The ESD data base design requires that resource utilization data be expressed in equivalent manmonths (176 hours) and timephased in terms of months after contract award or project start. The data are timephased so that they can be used to evaluate the Rayleigh curve timephasing used by SLIM and JS-1 and the resource allocation by phase method in COCOMO. They can also be used to select an appropriate method from the choices offered in PRICE-S.

2.5 WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

SAMPLE PRODUCTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE

Since the work breakdown structure (WBS) is the scheme generally used for organizing cost data and for reporting cost performance on DoD programs, the WBS methodology has been selected as the structure for organizing the software cost data base. This decision required the development of a standard software work breakdown structure for integration into a project WBS defined in accordance with MIL-STD-881A (Ref. 25). In order to facilitate comparison of projects at the lower levels of detail, ESD must adopt a standard WBS with detailed definitions comparable to those in MIL-STD-881A. Ideally, this standard would be accepted by the other DoD software developers.

The WBS definition began with a review of the WBSs in use for cost performance data reporting at ESD. The analysis encompassed all active ESD programs, as well as projects completed within the last ten years. In general, older projects did not use a detailed WBS for software and in many cases the software effort was located below the reporting level. Over the years, the level of software detail reported has been increasing in parallel with the growth in the importance of software for ESD systems. The majority of projects now obtain cost data at the CPCI level.

The results of the above review were then compared with several proposed software work breakdown structures (Refs. 6, 26, 27, 28). In contrast to the product-oriented structure identified in MIL-STD-881A, many of the proposed approaches have either an accounting or a functional orientation. However, these other approaches are not incompatible with a product-oriented WBS, since the functional and accounting shredouts can be made within a product-oriented WBS below the lowest product level of interest. For software developments the CPCI

level defines a natural subdivision of the product and is the level most commonly used for cost estimating. Breakouts below this level are either artificial, such as the CPC, or are at too great a level of detail for cost effective data collection, such as the module. Therefore, the CPCI has been selected as the key element to be included in the software work breakdown structure. Extension of the WBS below this level will be left to the discretion of the developer.

Above the CPCI level, a software effort can be logically subdivided at the system level into one or more subsystems. Each subsystem can then be divided into one or more Although a software subsystem is a logical and not a physical entity, it is still analogous to a hardware subsystem and should be treated in the same manner. The recommended WBS shown in Table 2.5-1 is an enhancement of a MIL-STD-881A WBS with software subsystems in parallel with hardware subsystems at level three. Support software is treated as a separate software subsystem. Each software subsystem is extended to level tour into a breakout of the subsystem design activity, the subsystem integration, and the CPCIs of which it is composed. This WBS is based on an alternative presented in SARE. other alternatives in SARE were rejected because they do not cover any situations that cannot be handled within the recommended approach and could result in confusion and inconsistent application.

During the data collection effort the recommended WBS was discussed with several defense contractors and the general reaction was favorable. The recommended WBS was similar to those being adopted by these contractors for their internal management requirements. These contractors also stressed the need for standardization.

TABLE 2.5-1
DEFENSE SYSTEM WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

Level l	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Defense Sys	tem		
	Prime Missi	on Equipment	
			n and Assembly
		Hardware S	ubsystem or End Item 1
		_	
		-	
		Hardware S *Software S	ubsystem or End Item n ubsystem 1
		5011	Subsystem Analysis & Design
			Subsystem Integration & Test
			Computer Program Configuration Item 1
			_
			-
			Computer Program Configuration Item n
		*Software S	inheret em n
		*Support So	
		оприл об	Computer Program Configuration Item 1
			•
			_
			Computer Program Configuration Item n
	Training	В.	
		Equipment	
		Services Facilities	
	Peculiar Su	racilities pport Equipme	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
	iccarini bu	Organizati	
		Intermedia	
		Depot	
	System Test	& Evaluation	i
			t Test & Evaluation
			l Test & Evaluation
		Mockups	
			luation Support
	Suctom/Dena	Test Facil	
	system/rrog	ram Managemen	
		Systems En Project Ma	
		Troject na	magement

 $^{{\}rm *Replaces}$ Computer Program at Level 3 from MIL-STD-881A

SERVED NO CONTRACTOR SERVED SERVES OF SERVED SERVED SERVED DEPORTED AND SERVED SERVED

TABLE 2.5-1
DEFENSE SYSTEM WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (Continued)

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	Data		
		Technical P	ublications
		Engineering	Data
		Management	Data
		Support Dat	a
		Data Deposi	tory
ļ	Operational/S	Site Activati	on
	•		Technical Support
		Site	
		Constructio	n
		Site/Ship/V	ehicle Conversion
		System Asse	mbly Installation &
		Checkout on	Site
	Common Suppor	rt Equipment	
		Organizatio	ona l
		Intermediat	.e
		Depot	
	Industrial Fa	acilities	
		Construction	on/Conversion/Expansion
[Equipment A	Acquisition or Modernization
•		Maintenance	•
	Initial Spare	es & Initial	Repair Parts
	•		

2.6 DATA BASE STRUCTURE

The data base is organized using the recommended WBS. At level one, the defense system, data describing the system mission, major functions, hardware interfaces, development tools and methodologies, system level documentation page counts, and change history are collected. Additional data describing product characteristics, the development environment, and development resources are collected at the CPCI level for those elements that are different for each CPCI. Schedule and failure data are also collected at this level.

Sizing and functional data are collected, at a minimum, to the CPCI level for cost estimation and down to the lowest level available for size estimation. Resource expenditure

data are collected for every element of the WBS that applies to software only. For projects that are entirely software, cost data are collected for all elements of the WBS.

During the data retrieval process, analogies are progressively developed starting at the defense system level to select homogeneous projects for further analysis, continuing at the CPCI level to select CPCIs for software cost model validation/calibration or development, and at the module level for software sizing. Depending on the size of the data base and the sample size requirements for a statistically valid analysis, restrictive criteria are selected from the characteristics and functions at the appropriate level to select a homogeneous subset of the data base.

DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

The establishment of a data base from the design described in Chapter 2 required the development of data collection formats and a data collection methodology. The approach taken also provides for use of the formats for future data collection to maintain the data base and for data collection for cost estimating model input. Appendix A contains tables which cross-reference the COCOMO, SLIM, PRICE-S, and JS-1 cost model input parameters to the data collection formats. In addition to detailing the methodology developed for the initial collection, this chapter also proposes approaches for data base maintenance and growth.

3.1 COLLECTION FORMATS

ACCEPTATE OF STREETS SECRECATED SPECIFICATION (SPECIFICATION OF SECRECATED SECRECATED SPECIFICATION OF SECRECATION OF

3.

The data collection formats were developed using the Mitre SARE (Ref. 6) formats as a strawman. Formats developed by DACS, NSA, NASA-SEL, and the Aerospace Corporation were also evaluated and the best elements were selected from each of the different approaches. Other elements represent new designs to enhance clarity and useablity or to add unique data items. Four separate formats were originally developed to allow for the different software decomposition levels at which data items would be collected. As a result of this initial data collection effort, a fifth format was developed to separately collect hardware data. The data collection package also includes a comprehensive set of instructions. Figure 3.1-1 summarizes the contents of each element of the data collection package.




Figure 3.1-1 Data Collection Package

3.1.1 Software Development Project Summary Data

This format (Figure 3.1-2) is designed to collect data at the top level of the WBS, the defense system. It includes descriptions of the mission of the system as a whole, specification of the hardware interfaces required, identification of the system functions and the allocation of those functions to the software elements of the system. These data are used for classification of the system so that it can be grouped with similar systems for analysis and for model validation or calibration.

The format also contains a checklist of commonly used software development tools and techniques. These checklists are used in conjunction with data elements on the CPCI Summary Data format to develop inputs for several cost models requiring an assessment of the development environment. A schedule at

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SUMMARY DATA	4 5 Testing
	Top Down(stube) Bottom Up(drivers)
1 Project Hame Date	Specification Driven Structure Driven
2 Development Contractor/Organization	NoneOther
3 Project Description	4 6 Validatios/Verificatios(Inspectios)
3 i Mission Description	Peer Review Welk Throughs Proof
	None Other
	· 7 Formalisma
3 2 Major Hardware Interfaces	Program Design Language(Specify)
,	MIPO Charts Flowcharts Chapso Charts MOS
3 3 Major System Functions	Other
)) Hajor System Punctions	5 Software Development Tools Used
	Assumbler Best Linter
	Basic Houston Batch Dabug Aids
) 4 Major Software Functions	Higher Order Language Hacro Assembler
	Compiler Simple Overlay Linker
	Basic Source Editor Language Independent Homitor
3 5 Number of CPCia	Basic Library Aids Basic Data Base Aids
3 6 CPCI Mages	Real-time or Timesharing Extended Overlay Linker
	Operating System Database Management System
1 ' System Laer	lateractive Debug Aids Sumple Programming Support Library
Development Contractor Uther Commercial Company	Interactive Source Editor Virtual Memory Operating System
Department of Defense Other Government Agency	Database Design Aid Simple Program Design Language
	Performance Measurement Programming Support Library Will
* Development Methodologies used	And Analysis Aids Basic Configuration Management Aids
w Specification	Set-Use Static Analyzer Contro. Flow Static Analyzer
Functions: Procedural English Other	Boast Text Editor & Manager Program Flow and Test Case Analyzer
- 2 Design	File Memager Full Programming Support Library
Top Down Bottom Up Iterative Enhancement	Documentation System Project Control System
Hardest First None Other	Requirements Specification Extended Design Tools
- \ Development	
Top Down Bottom Up Iterative Enhancement	Language and Analyzer Automated Verification System
Hardest first None Other	Fault Report System Crosscompilers
+ + Coding	Instruction Set Simulators Display Formatters
,	Data Entry Control Tools
Simulating construct Structured Code Mane	Conversion Aids Structured Language Too;
Other	
	Other Sther
	Other Sther
Uther	Other Sther Other Sther
	Other Sther
Other 6 Development Schedule	Other Sther Other Uther
Other b Development Schedule Original Actual Estimated	Other Other Other Other 8 Software Change History F of Changes Est d DSLOC Est J Tappower
Other Development Schedule Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Date	Other Other Other 8 Software Change History F of Changes Eat's DSLOC Est J Suppower Development Phone Approved Change Change
Other Development Schedule Origins: Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Controll Award	Other Other Other # of Changes Let & DSLOC Est J Teapower Development Phone Approved Change * Change
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review	Other Other Other Other # of Changes Est d DSLDC Est J Manpower Development Phase Approved Change *
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review	Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Est d DSLOC Est J Magnower Development Phase Approved Change * Cha
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Freiminary Design Review	Other Other Ster
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review	Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Est d DSLOC Est J Magnower Development Phase Approved Change * Cha
Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review Freilminery Design Review Preliminery Design Review	Other Other Ster
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review	Other Other Other # of Changes Est d DSLOC Est J Manager Development Phase Approved Change *
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review	Other Other Other # of Changes Est & DSLOC Est J Manpower Development Phone Approved Change * Change
Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Contract Award System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Upsign Estimated Formal Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test	Other Other Other Other # of Changes Est & DSLOC Est J manpower Development Phase Approved Change ** Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDB) Detailed Besign (PDB to CDB*) Code & Debug (CDB to Test & Integ Stort) Test & Integration
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System	Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Est d DSLOC Est J Magnower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDB) Detailed Design (PDB to CDB) Code & Dobug (CDB to Test & Integ Start) Test & Integration (Test & lateg Start to FQT)
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System - ompiete CPCI Integration into System	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Other Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Complete CPCT Integration into System Start Development Test & Evaluation	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Fromal Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete CPCI Integrations Test & Evaluation System Development Test & Evaluation Start Development Test & Evaluation	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Unstitution Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Complete CPCT Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Start Development Test & Evaluation Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Eval	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Requirements Review Freiminary Design Review Freiminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Scart Development Test & Evaluation Scart Instin, Operational Test & Eval Complete CPC Integration Audit Physics, Configuration Audit	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review -critical Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System -complete CPCI Integration into System Start Development Test & Evaluation complete Development Test & Evaluation scart Instar Operations: Test & Eval -complete Development Test & Eval	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Requirements Review Freiminary Design Review Freiminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Scart Development Test & Evaluation Scart Instin, Operational Test & Eval Complete CPC Integration Audit Physics, Configuration Audit	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Requirements Review Preliminary Operation Test Formal Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete CPCI integrations Test & Evaluation Start Instin, Operations, Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Complete Instinguage Test & Evaluation Co	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Critical Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPCI Integration late System Complete CPCI Integration into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Co	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review -critical Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPCI Integration late System -omplete CPCI Integration into System Start Development Test & Evaluation complete Initial Operations, Test & Eval complete Sitem Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Documentation	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milestone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Critical Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Complete CPCI integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Scart Initial Operations, Test & Eval Complete Development Test & Evaluation Scart Initial Operations, Test & Eval Complete Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Documentation	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Scart Institut Operations, Test & Eval Functions, Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Document City, System Conjugation Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Document City, System Conjugation Configuration Document City, System Conjugation Document City, System City,	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Requirements Review System Datign Review Preliminary Design Review Critical Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Complete CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Start Initial Operations. Test & Eval Complete CPC Integrations Test & Eval Complete Development Test & Evaluation Start Initial Operations. Test & Eval Complete Configuration Audit Physics. Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Documentation Document Title System Place Cat Jur Actual System Engineering Management Place Completer Program Development Place	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Requirements Review Preliminary Design Review Critical Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPCI Integration late System Complete CPCI Integration into System Complete CPCI Integration into System Complete Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Complete Initial Operations, Test & Eval Functions, Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Document Color	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Dasign Review Preliminary Operation Test Formal Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Complete CPCI integration into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Complete Initial Operational Test & Eval Functional Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Documentation Journal Title Pages Est Bur Actual Computer Program General Plan Computer Program General Plan Computer Program General Computer Plan Co	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Into System Complete CPCT Integration Into System Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Scart Initial Operations, Test & Eval Functions, Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Journal Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Journal Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Journal Configuration Configuration Computer Program Gevelopment Plan System Test Plan Uther John Test Plan Uther	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Milentone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Datigo Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Test Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Somplete CPCI Integrations Test & Eval Start Development Test & Evaluation Start Development Test & Evaluation Start Initial Operations. Test & Eval Complete Development Test & Eval Start Initial Operations. Test & Eval Complete Initial Operations. Test & Eval System Delivery Document Test Operations Addit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Documentation Junuary Test Plan Wither There Ther	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC
Original Actual Estimated Project Mileatone Date Date Date Contract Award System Requirements Review System Design Review Preliminary Design Review Preliminary Qualification Test Formal Qualification Into System Complete CPCT Integration Into System Start CPC! Integration Into System Start Development Test & Evaluation Complete Development Test & Evaluation Scart Initial Operations, Test & Eval Functions, Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Journal Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Journal Configuration Audit Formal Qualification Review System Delivery Journal Configuration Configuration Computer Program Gevelopment Plan System Test Plan Uther John Test Plan Uther	Other Other Other Other Other Other # of Changes Eat d DSLOC Est J Waspower Development Phase Approved Change * Change *** Preliminary Design (Contract Award to PDR) Detailed Design (PDR to CDR) Code & Dobug (CDR to Tent & Integ Start) Test & lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration (Test & Lategration) System Test/IOC

Figure 3.1-2 Software Development Project Summary Form

the total project level is included to facilitate allocation of resource expenditure data to the different phases of the software development process.

System level documentation page counts are requested as a prospective variable for use in estimating documentation cost and for measuring software maintainability. A software change history is also included for an evaluation of software requirements volatility and its impact on software cost.

A copy of this format is prepared for each project and is used both for additions to the data base and to collect cost model input parameters for an estimate. It can also be used to collect data for analogy selection at the project level.

3.1.2 Computer Hardware Detail Data

This format (Figure 3.1-3) is designed to collect data about the target computer on which the software product will operate and about the computer on which the software is being developed. The constraints of the target computer are identified to define the operational environment for the software. The memory and time utilization by the software is specified, along with reserve requirements and expansion capability, so that an assessment can be made of constraints on the development process caused by these operational requirements. The development computer characteristics and its effectiveness as a resource are likewise addressed.

This format is prepared for each target computer in the system and its related development computer. It is used for additions to the data base and for collection of cost model input parameters.

DEVELOPMENT AND TARGET COMPUTER DATA FORM	2 Development Commuter
	2 Some on Target Computer Yes No
	If No. Manufacturer Mone: Number
Target Computer	Difference Between Development and Target Computer
1 1 Manufacturer Model Mumber	nittetence microes Disatelmer and faillet combites
2 Sain Sementy Size in words word SizeBics	
1 3 Maximus Mais Mesory Size	2 2 Turneround Time
IPL Processing Speed	
1.5 Reserve Memory Requirement	Low (interactive specify) Member (** thre
h Reserve Timing Requirement	High to-(2hra) Very digh (>12hra-
Concurrent Development with software Yes No	 Percentage of Source Instructions Developed Uning Each of the following Access Modes "Totalm1005"
4 - ortwal Machine volaticity	A Belco%
very low low Nominal High very High	# Dedicated Processor 1
9 Percent Stillization 5:\$ 51-10\$ 11-85\$ 46-95\$ 195\$	Test Bed with High Priority 1
4 .PL Tegory	2 Test Red with Low Priority 2
9 faerut,on *: ee	1 interactive
. J. P. Memory constraint Evacuation	F 9ther1
to tempre Economy teasures Required	For interactive Development indicate the Average Number of
suge Percay use or Segmentation Required	Softwere Engineers Progressers per Terminas
Extensive overlay And for Segmentation Required	. S. Number of Development Sites
Japies Memory Management Economy Measures Required	2 6 Development Site Locations
Pt *.me onstraint Evaluation	
No Sottware is JPL Time onstrained	
12 if Source He is Time unstrained	2 * Development computer Locationis:
50% of Source one is "ime constrained	
"% of Source Code is "ime constrained	
. Pris Hasted on This computer	: 8 Softwere Development Tool Usage
	very low low Montant High very High
	2.9 Development computer Assource Availablicate

Figure 3.1-3 Development and Target Computer Data Form

3.1.3 CPCI Summary Data

This format (Figure 3.1-4) is designed to collect data at the CPCI level. The data required at this level are determined primarily by the input parameters of the COCOMO, SLIM, PRICE-S, and JS-1 cost models.

The format begins with the name of the CPCI and a narrative description which can be used for analogy selection and homogeneous grouping of CPCIs. Next, the experience of the development personnel relative to the development environment and the software application, as well as the quality of the personnel, is assessed.

The balance of the format is concerned with the characteristics and size of the software. As required by several of

	Column	Company Comp	Section Sect	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	1982 1985	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	1	Delta	Company
Secretary Secr	Secretary Designation	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	March Marc	March Marc	Angle Angl	March Marc	March Marc	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Section Sect
		1	1	A Property Control of the Control of	S. Foregone Annictation 1 S. Foregone Annictati	S. J. Manganer Anticlasions 2 - Price March States 2 - States March States 3 - States March States 3 - States March States 4 - States March March States 4 - States March March States 4 - States March Marc	A Property Control of the Control of	A Programme Association of the Control of the Contr	A STANDARD MARKET STANDARD STANDARD MARKET STA	1
A Part Marie Mar	Secretar Date Secretar Dat	Secretarian	Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Secretaria Se	Secretary Secr	Secretary Secr	Secretary Secr	Secretary Secr	Secretaria Sec	Secretaria Description Secretaria Descript	Secretar Date Secretar Dat
Processor Designation Proc	Secretario Registration Regist	Security Sec	Secretary Design Account Secretary S	Secretary Secr	State Stat		Secretary Secr	Secretarian Property Secretarian Sec	Secretarian Report	Second State Seco
March 10 to September 10 to Se	March See Se	Services Date Services Servic	Services Date Services Servic	A Treatment Data	A Secretary Secr	A Commission Colors	A Treatment Data	A Treatment Data	A deportance of the control of the c	March See March Right Control Cont
Companies Office Companies	Very law Same Services Service	Personal Content Personal Co	Comment of the Comm	Commission Date Dat	Commission Office Commission Commissio	Company Comp	Commission Date Dat	Commission Date Commission	Communication Date	Personance Per
Very case Imperior	Very law Law Season Se	Section Sect	Secretary Reservances Secretary Secr		Very new Law Season Se	Very Name September Sept		Very law Law Seek	Personal Section Secti	March September Septembe
Description	Design Action Extractions Date Dat	Section Sect	Designation		Description	State Stat			Organic Organic Date D	Designation Date
Principality Notice Date	Design State Date	Description Date	Design State	Decignoses thereines Decignoses Decignos	Decignoses therefore I necessary Recommendation	Decign State Section Processing Section Processing Section Processing	Decignoses thereines Decignoses Decignos	Decignoses thereines Dec Date Date Decignoses D	Secretarian Displace And Secretarian Secretaria Sec	Private Private Date Dat
Date	Design State Date	Description Date	Design State	Decignoses thereines Decignoses Decignos	Decignoses therefore I necessary Personal I necessary Personal I necessary Decignoses Apertification Agreement I necessary Decignoses Apertification Agreement I necessary Decignoses Apertification Agreement I necessary Decignoses I nec	Decign State Section Processing Section Processing Section Processing	Decignoses thereines Decignoses Decignos	Decignoses thereines Dec Date Date Decignoses D	Secretarian Displace And Secretarian Secretaria Sec	Private Private Date Dat
Process Proc	State			Design States Principles P	Design States Principles Pr	Design States	Design States Principles P	Design States Principles P	Design Nature Personners Design Person	State Presentation Present Presentation Pre
Development Specification Appeared Developme	Personal Specification Approval Development Specification Approval Development Specification Approval District Content Specification Test District Content Specification Test District Content Specification Test District Content Specification Test District Content Specification Approval District Content Specification Deproval District Content Specification	Personal Special Engineers Section Design Review Section Approxis Section Approxis Section Design Review Section Rev	Percentage Specification Approxis Development Specification Proximate Specification Specifica	Personal Special Control of the Cont	Personal Specification Approved Surround Specification Approved Surround Specification Su	Personal Special Congress Agricultural Congress of Special Congress Specia	Personal Special Control of the Cont	Personal Special Control of Spec	Personner Serge Review Development Specification Appears Control Design Person Control D	Personal Special Control on Approval Description of Special Special Control on Approval Description of Special Control on Approval District Control of Special Control on Approval District Control of Special Control on Approval District Control of Special Control of Cont
Description Description Approved Description Descr	Descriptions Design Requirements A conservation Register on Source code Exclusing Deciminations	Description Approva Control Design Province on Approva Control Design Provance Control Design Provance Control Design Province Control Design Provance Control Design Provance Control Design Province Control De	Description Approved	Development Special Control Agreement Service 1	Development Special Control Approved Control Control Processing Approved Control of State Control Contr	Decomposity Special Control Agreements 1	Development Special Control Agreement Service 1	Development Special Control Agreement Service Control	Description Services approve 1	Description Despite Control Approval A control Control Process A control Control Process A control Control Despite Control Despite Control
1	1 - come of Notice and Antique Communitations	Section Design Receive Section of Communication Section of Communication Section Sec	A control process A co	1 - commany Consequences 1 - commany Consequ	A country of companies A country of continued to the continue of the conti	1 - Course of Notice and Company 1 - Course of Notice and Company	1 - commany Consequences 1 - commany Consequ	1 - Common Common Debugging	1 - Court of Notice are noticemental and court of the c	1 Section of Company
Some processes of the	Some Services of the processing and the services of the serv	# * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	State Communications are all to the foreign and the first and the first are all to the first and the first are all to the first are all the first are all to the first are all to the first are all the first are all the first are all the first are all the first a	Signature for a Price of Absention Appearance	State Designed State State of Price	Start Disease Requirements Support Software Forum Requirements Support Software Requirement	Signature for a Price of Absention Appearance	State Designed State Time in Press or Interest to Designed State Time in Press or Interest to Designed State Time in Designed State Time	Night Looking Debugging 8.1 Data Date fire on Process or Assertion as a Percent of State Coloning Debugging 8.3 Save Presention by Special Designation of Test 8.5 Save Presention by Special Designation of Test 8.5 Save Presention by Special Designation of Test 8.5 Save Presention of Test 8.5 Save Present 8.5 Save	Section of the process of the proc
Secretary (designated and the second of the	Description of Personal State Control of Per	# Special Displace Application Personal Processing	## Special Display Requirements Support Software Requirements Support Software Requiremen	# Size President to Special form of Text	# Size President to Special form of Test # 1005 Start Astronia Integration in Test # 1005 Astronia Integration in Test # 1005 President Special Conference # 1 President # 1	# Special Display Requirements Special Display Requirements	# Size President to Special form of Text	# Application Requirements Security Security Security Security Security Security Secur	# A Application Research Street Secretary Secretar	Description of Personal Statement (Interpretation of Interpretation of Interpret
A Application Area A Application Area A Application Area A Application Area B A Application Area A Application Area B A Application Area B A Application Area B A Application Area	State Storage Description in Test find information integration in Test find information in Test find information integration in Test find information in Test find in Test	State Stormes Integration in Test find informat Integration in Test find information Approved fin	State disease integration in Test Indications Disease to integration in Test Indications Disease training Test Indications Disease training Test Indications Disease training Test Indication Disease Test Indication Disease Test Indication	State Stormer Integration in Test find informer Integration in Integration in Integration find informer Integration in Integration in Integration find informer Integration integration find informer Integration integration find informer Integration integration find integration integration integration find integra	State transmit integration in Test find informati integration in Test find informati integration in Test find informati integration in Test find information integration in Test find information integration in Test find information in Test find i	State streams integration in Test for integration in Integration Approved for integration integration Approved for integration integration Approved for integration integration integration for integration Audit for integr	State Stormer Integration in Test find informer Integration in Integration in Integration find informer Integration in Integration in Integration find informer Integration integration find informer Integration integration find informer Integration integration find integration integration integration find integra	State Storman Integration in Test find integration integration in Integration integration in Integrat	Sale Storme Integration in Test 100 Integrat Communications Test 100 Integrat Communications 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	System integration in Test
# Operation Displace Requirements Processing Company Processing Company	Encountering integration Test	# Operation Test Procedure Accordance Test	# Service Integration affect Production Communication Com	Bottom Communications Security Communica	Indications integration a Test Pre-major (principles) Pre-major Pre-maj	The intermal clargeration of Test Procedure Processing Community of the	Bottom Communications Security Communica	Both Continued	Indications integration with the first content of t	# Service Depice Requirements Some interaction Test
President productive control for the command of control to the command of control to the control	Free-mainers questionation feet Free-mainers questionate feet feet Free-mainers despute feet Free-mainers questionate feet feet feet feet feet Free-mainers questionate feet feet feet feet feet Free-mainers despute feet Free-mainers questionate feet feet feet feet feet feet feet f	President command of logger	President possible station feet Product Special Continues of Contin	Freedomer's Constitution Feet Included Specification Agents Entitle Constitution Agents Entitle Constitution Agents Entitle Constitution Adult Freedom Specification Freedo	French many found first to the formation fast formation assertions and fast fast fast fast fast fast fast fast	Freedometry Quarterston Test Second Construction Test Second Construction Construction Second Construction Agents Second Construction Adult Second Cons	Freedomer's Constitution Fast Included Specification Past Fundamental Control of Fundamental	Freedomer's Construction Test Constructive Operations 1	Personal Display Requirements Personal Perso	President positional of the formation for the formation positions are presented to the formation and t
Product Specification Agencies	Contractive Operations Contractive Operation Address Contractive Operation Address Contractive Operation Address Contractive Operation O	Description of the control of the	Contractive Operations 1	Interactive Operations	Contractive Operations Contractive Operati	From Journal Special Continues Approved From State Speci	Interactive Operations	Contractive Operations Contractive Operati	Contention Operations Contention Operation Contention Operation Contention Operation Operation Contention Operation Operation Contention Cont	Contentive Operations
Product Sprintingtion Approva (antiques integration Addit) (b) Protest integration Addit) (b) Protest integration Streethout Assessment (c) Antiques integration Streethout Assessment (c) Antiques integration Streethout Assessment (d) Antiques integration Streethout S	Product Special strom Approva Lantinas Integral on August Photos on Integral on August Some St. Note that the second of the s	Final Contents on Approximation And Contents on And Contents o	Francisco Specialización Adolf Santinos infiguration Adolf Adolf infiguration Adolf Santinos infiguration Adolf Adolf infiguration Adolf Santinos infiguration Santinos infigurat	Frontings of Englands of Additions of Englands of Strong Paragrances of Strong Paragranc	Product Special attoo Approva functions infiguration Audit String Paspoints Strin	Fronting Special attoo Approva functions, intigeration Audit Strong Paraphoration Str	Frontings of Englands of Additions of Englands of Strong Paragrances of Strong Paragranc	Fronting Special Strom Approva Enclosed of England Special Sp	Frincis Depart Requirements Secure Design Requirements Secure Design	Product Special attom Approva. Cantinas Infigurarion Addat Strong Malapuskion Approval on Antiquerarion Addat Strong Malapuskion Approval on Antiquerarion Addat Strong Malapuskion Approval on Antiquerarion Addat Strong Malapuskion A Mala to 12
# Special Display Requirements Support Volume Forest of Steen Support Requirements Support Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Requirements Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Requirements Special Display Requirements Special Display Requirements	# Approximation August	France F	Foresting Special Special Contemporaries Foresting Special Contemporaries Strong Responsation Strong R	Functional infragration August Functional infragration Function Functional infragration Functional i	Foreign Special Company Requirements Foreign Special Company Requirements Foreign Special Company Foreign Special Company	Forecast Display Requirements Sometimal Specification Approximation Approximation Sometimal Specification Sometimal	Functional infragration August Functional infragration Function Functional infragration Functional i	Functional infragration August Functional infragration Func	Functions approved Functions integration Audit Should Accordant to Audit Should Accordant Audit Accordant Audit Accordant Audit Accordant Audit Accordant Audit Accordant Audit Accordant Audit Aud	Formula Specification August 1
Financians infragretion Addit	# Special Display Requirements Software Failure Masters Software Mas	### Press on Engine Form Audit	## Special Display Requirements Strong Tailore History Pression Audit Pression Audit Pression Audit	Foreign antiquestion Audit Province unfiguration Audit A STATE AUDIT United unfiguration and unfiguration under und und der under under under und und der under und und der under under und und der under und der under under und der under und der under under under under und der under und und der under und der under under under und der u	### Strong National Audit	# Special Display Requirements Some Statement Sta	Foreign antiquestion Audit Province unfiguration Audit A STATE AUDIT United unfiguration and unfiguration under und und der under under under und und der under und und der under under und und der under und der under under und der under und der under under under under und der under und und der under und der under under under und der u	Presence unfiguration Audit Presence unfiguration Audit unfiguration Au	Principle of type of the principle of th	# Special Display Anguirements Second Particle Second Particle
Photos uniquestion Audit S hefter Acceptation States could Assessment Brown ST	Phenome undequestion Audit S hedge Accordance State Condition of Assessment Some SS S SA S	Phenomen unfoquention Audit S hedger Acceptation Stretchool Assessment Brown SS IS ARE NO UCL SI Son E ACC Apprications Response Requirements Stretchool As a Percent Bo common stretchool Acceptation Stretchool Acceptation Acceptat	Phenomenon uniquestion Audit Shedur Ancereation Stretchol Assessment Shedur Ancereation Stretchol Assessment Stretchol Stretchol Assessment Stretchol	Personal United Particles (1988) Shower Anterioration State (1981) As Application Area By Topics (1981) A Application Area Complete Analysis (1981) Complete Analysis (1981)	Personal Uniquestion Audit Sheller Anterestion State Could Assessment	Photos unfiguration Audit 2 Product Accordance Segment 2 Product Segment 3 Product Segment 4 Product Segment 5 Product Segment 5 Product Segment 6 Product Segment 7 Product Se	Personal United Particles (1988) Shower Anterioration State (1981) As Application Area By Topics (1981) A Application Area Complete Analysis (1981) Complete Analysis (1981)	Personal Unit guestion Audit 2	Personal antiquestion Audit Section Accordance Section Accordance Section Sec	Phenome undreguestion Audit 2 New Action Accounts assessment Accounts 1 NATE and US 10 to 12 AC Apprication Accounts B Comparations are common account index counts byte A Apprication Accounts B Training Experience B Traini
Brown NY 19 AND NOT 15 INC. AND 15 INC. AN	brown NY NY ANY NOTICE TO THE TOTAL	Britaning St. 19 AND No. 102 10 102 1	brink NS No ANS	Section Display Requirements Section S	Second State Second Seco	book NS NAME to 10% to	Section Display Requirements Section S	Clar	A Application Are Percent 100 10 10 10 10 10 10	brown Ng Ny Ang so 100 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Berow NY NANY NOTICE to the NANY NOTICE AND THE STREET AND THE STR	# Special Display Requirements Support Software Tools 100	# 'Special Display Requirements Support Software Tools State Services State Services	# ' Special Display Requirements Support Statement Support Statement Support	Appropriate to the forest process of the for	Below NS NAME to 102 to 10.2 And And There is a Superstance Appropriate to 10.2 And There is a Superstance Appropriate to 10.2	Below St. 19 ANT No. 102 to to 1 ANT No. 102 to to 1 ANT No. 100 to 1 Ant	Appropriate to the forest process of the for	Below NS NAME to 102 to 10.2 t	Below NS NANT to 102 to 10.2 And And Superstook Requirements Distribution As a Period Superstook Requirement Superstook Requirements Distribution As a Period Superstook Requirements Distribution Requirements Dist	## Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Requirements Support Special Display Representation Support
## Symptotic Requirements Symptotic Requirements Symptotic Response Re	# Superior Requirements District Continues Dist	A Application Area B	# A Application Area # A Application Area # B Formaliques used # A Courte Statement Type This Als Percent of the B Cotal of Statement Type This Als Percent of the B Cotal of Statement Type This Als Percent of the B Cotal of Statement Type This Als Percent of the B Cotal of Statement Type This Als Percent of the B Cotal of Statement Type This Als Percent of the B Cotal of Statement Type This Als Percent of Statement Type This Also Type Statement Type This Type This This Type Statement Type This This Type This This Type This This	A Application Area B Techniques used Internal Equipment Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirements A Application Area B Techniques used Internal Equipment Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement A	A Application Area B Techniques used A Application Area B Techniques used A Logica Tachnique used A Logica Tachnique used A Logica Tachnique used A Logica Tachnique B Techniques used A Logica Tachnique B Techniques used A Logica Tachnique B Techniques used A Logica Tachnique C Useta Mempuration C Useta Mempu	A Application Area B Techniques used A Application Area B Techniques used A Logica	A Application Area B Techniques used Internal Equipment Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirements A Application Area B Techniques used Internal Equipment Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement Type This As a Percent of the August Acquirement A	A Application Area A Application Area B Techniques used Lend & Displace Requirements B Techniques used Lend & Displace Requirements A Application Area B Techniques used Lend & Displace Requirements A Displace Time Time At a Percent of the Act of Time At a Percent of Time	A Application Area A Application Area	# Superstance #
A Application Area B Techniques used A Application Area B Techniques used A Logical Display Acquirements Support Notiner Tools B Topical Display Acquirements Support Notiner Tools B United Management Display Acquirements Support Notiner Tools B United Management Display Acquirements Support Notiner Tools B United Management Display Acquirements Full Software Factors Full Software Included to PDB B Longuage Used on a Percent of the B Total TOOLS A Longuage Used on a Percent of the B Total TOOLS A Longuage Used on a Percent of the B Total TOOLS A Longuage Used on a Percentage I Used A Cobugat DBB to DBB B Longuage Percentage I Used A Cobugat DBB to DBB B Longuage Percentage I Used A Cobugat DBB to DBB B Longuage Percentage I Used A Cobugat DBB to DBB B Longuage Percentage I Used A Cobugat DBB to DBB B Longuage Used A Cobugat DBB to DBB to DBB B Longuage Used A Cobugat DBB to DB	A Application Area B Techniques used	A Application Area Solition	A Application Area B Teachique used 1	Comparison Com	A Application Area 1	Application Area 1	Comparison Com	Special Display Requirements Support Systems	A Application Area B Jerhangues used	A Application Area B Techniques used S B Miliane S B
A Application Area 1	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used C Source Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of ten B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of the B Total of the Statement Type His As a Percent of the Statement Type His As a Percent of the Statement Type His Assert to Parcent of the Statement Type His Assert to Parcent of the Statement Type His Assert to Parcent of the Statement Type His Assert	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Management See Source Indicated Type Mis As a Percent of See A Source Management See Source Indicated Type Mis Associated Type Mis Asso	A Application Area 1	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used A Course Statement Type Ris As a Percent of State Office of State of St	A Application Area B Techniques used	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used A Source Statement Type Als a Percent of State State anguages tand A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type Als As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State B Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State A Source Statement Type As a Percent of State State Test A Statement Type As a Percent State The Admitted State State Test A Statement Type As a Percent Type Test A Statement Type As a Percent Type Test A	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used A Course Statement Type Ris As a Percent of State Office of State of St	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of Local Statement of Cambridge Statement Type Mis As a Percent of Local Statement of Cambridge Statement Type Mis As a Percent of Local Statement of Cambridge Statement of Cam	A Application Area B Techniques used B Techniques used A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of time 6 Total of City of	## Paper and the process of the proc
# Application Area B Techniques userd	# Application Area # Termingues used # Observe Statement Top Mis As a Percent of ten # Total of the sequence of ten # Total o	# Application Area Techniques used	## Application Area Town-Constraint Town-Co	## Application Area Transquery used	## Application Area 1	## Application Area ## O Source Statement Type His As a Percent time # Total to CS canguages used ## A cognise ## B command ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## A cognise ## B command ## A sequence ## B command ## A cognise ## B command to CS ## B command ## B comma	## Application Area Transquery used	## Application Area ## O Source Statement Type His As a Percent Committee of the Action of Committee	## A Application Area ## A Source Statement Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the File His Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the File His Auguste Type His As a Percent for the foliance of the File His Assay Type His Assay Ty	# Application Area # Terminate and
# A Source Statement Type Min An a Percent of them 6 Total # 02 # Support Software Tools # Sup	# 6 Source Statement Tope His As a Percent of tee # Total of Ct sequence used used sometimes to see # Total of Ct sequence with the first terms of the sequence of the sequenc	# Special Display Requirements Support Software Foods Support Software Foods Support Software Foods Support Software Tools Support Software Foods Support Software Softwa	# Special Display Requirements Support Software Failure Mistory Software Failure Mistory	# A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of cem # Total t Ct canguage used . cortial Machine Support Software Tools Contament Co	# Special Display Requirements Special Display Requirements Support Notivere Tools Software Failure Mistory Support Notivere Tools Special Display Requirements Support Notivere Tools Software Failure Mistory Support Notivere Tools Special Display Requirements Support Notivere Tools Software Failure Mistory Support Notivere Tools Software Failure Mistory Support Notivere Tools Software Failure Mistory Software F	# O Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of cem # Total to Ct canguage used ***********************************	# A Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of cem # Total t Ct canguage used . cortial Machine Support Software Tools Contament Co	# O Source Statement Type Mis As a Percent of tee # Total 1 Ct canguage used . contain Manine Support Software Tools	# Special Display Requirements Support Notiwere Tools Special Display Requirements 10 Sottware Failure History 10 Sott	# O Source Statement Tope Mis As a Percent of Lee # Total of Ct canguage used
A cogres. \$ 8 command \$ Technolis. 8 Special Display Requirements Support Notivere Tools 10 Software Feature Wistory Support Notivere Loss Friendly interactive imples Requirements Severe logics 8 Complete Requirements Support Input Output Loss Friendly interactive imples Requirements Severe logics 8 Complete Requirements Severe logics 8 Complete Requirements Severe logics 9 Commission Co	# Cognes \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	A Logical S Command S Tathemetic Court Meministration S E Gata Deciaration S Support Software Tools Support Supp	A logical \$ 0 command \$ Terrement of the Surface of	A Logice. \$ 8 .command \$ Tetrevel.e. Finapport Notivere Tools Support Notivere Tools 10 Software Failure Mistory	A Logice. \$ 8 .command	A Logice. \$ 8 .command	A Logice. \$ 8 .command \$ Tetrevel.e. Finapport Notivere Tools Support Notivere Tools 10 Software Failure Mistory	Languages used A Lugico \$ 8 Jamand \$ Mainment of Support Notivere Tools Support Notivere Tools 10 Survere Failure Mistory	A Logical S Semand S Settlement S Logical S Settlement S Logical Display Requirements Support Notivere Tools Special Display Requirements 10 Settlement State of Settlement Support Input Output Logical Display Requirement Severe Logical Development Phase Following Requirement Severe Logical Development Phase Following Requirement Severe Logical Proceedings Proceedings Proceedings Logical Display Designation Control Display Logical Designation Control Display	Languages used Conta Mempuration Support Software Tools Support Software To
# Special Display Requirements Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Mistery	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Nation 1 Software Nation 1 Software Nation 1 Software Nation 1 Software Failure Nation 1 Software Failure Nation 1 Software Failure Nation 1 Software Nation 1 Soft	# Support Software Tools # Support Software	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure History 10 Softwa	Special Display Requirements 10 Software Failure History	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure History 10 Softwa	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure History 10 Softwa	Special Display Requirements 10 Software Failure History	Special Display Requirements 10 Software Failure Mistory	Special Display Requirements 10 Software Failure History	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Wistory
8 Special Display Requirements 10 Software Failure Mistory	# Special Diaptor Requirements :0 Software Failure History Sumple imput Output — Deer Friendly : Development Plane — Fol Software Failure History # 4 A manguage used as a Percent of Item # 1-Total i 1000	# Support Software Tools # Support Software Failure Mistory # Support Display Requirements # Union of Support Software Failure Mistory # Union of Support Sup	# Support Software Tools # Support Software Tools # Support Display Requirements Substance Tellure Mistory Substance Tellure Transfer	F Support Software Tools 5 Special Display Requirements 5 Subject input. Output Loar Friendly	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Wistory 10 Software Wistory 10 Software Failure Wistory 10 Software Failu	# Special Display Requirements Support Software Failure Mistory Support Display	F Support Software Tools 5 Special Display Requirements 5 Subject input. Output Loar Friendly	F. Support Software Tools 5. Special Display Requirements 5. Special Display Requirements 5. Special Display Requirements 5. Special Display Requirements 6. Support Software Failure History 5. Support Software Failure History 5. Support Software Failure History 5. Support Software Failure History 6. Support Software Failure History	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Mistory 10 Softwa	# Special Diaptor Requirements :0 Sultware Failure Nistory Sumple imput Output Deer Friendly Interactive Deeple Requirements Severe Impail Development Phase # of Software Failure Nistory # despinage used on a Percent of Item # 1-Tutal i 1001 Proceedings Total Design PDR to DR # anaguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design PDR to Test & along Start # despinage Percentage 1 Test & Integration Start to PUT # anaguage Percentage 1 Sultware Failure Nistory # System Test DK FOT to contract Land # Percentage Test & Integration Design Put # System Test DK FOT to contract Land # O Reduction Pequired # Total Reduction Pequired # Total Reduction Design
8 Special Display Requirements Sumple lapsit/Output Deer Friendly	# Special Diaptor Requirements :0 Software Failure History Sumple imput Output — Deer Friendly : Development Plane — Fol Software Failure History # 4 A manguage used as a Percent of Item # 1-Total i 1000	# Support Software Tools # Support Software Failure Mistory # Support Display Requirements # Union of Support Software Failure Mistory # Union of Support Sup	# Support Software Tools # Support Software Tools # Support Display Requirements Substance Tellure Mistory Substance Tellure Transfer	F Support Software Tools 5 Special Display Requirements 5 Subject input. Output Loar Friendly	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Wistory 10 Software Wistory 10 Software Failure Wistory 10 Software Failu	# Special Display Requirements Support Software Failure Mistory Support Display	F Support Software Tools 5 Special Display Requirements 5 Subject input. Output Loar Friendly	F. Support Software Tools 5. Special Display Requirements 5. Special Display Requirements 5. Special Display Requirements 5. Special Display Requirements 6. Support Software Failure History 5. Support Software Failure History 5. Support Software Failure History 5. Support Software Failure History 6. Support Software Failure History	Support Software Tools 10 Software Failure Mistory 10 Softwa	# Special Diaptor Requirements :0 Sultware Failure Nistory Sumple imput Output Deer Friendly Interactive Deeple Requirements Severe Impail Development Phase # of Software Failure Nistory # despinage used on a Percent of Item # 1-Tutal i 1001 Proceedings Total Design PDR to DR # anaguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design PDR to Test & along Start # despinage Percentage 1 Test & Integration Start to PUT # anaguage Percentage 1 Sultware Failure Nistory # System Test DK FOT to contract Land # Percentage Test & Integration Design Put # System Test DK FOT to contract Land # O Reduction Pequired # Total Reduction Pequired # Total Reduction Design
Sample Topic Output Deer Friendly Interactive Complex Requirements Severe Topic Development Phase s of Software Environ to B anaguages used as a Percent of Lees B (-Total 1 - 100) Previousnery Designicontest Award to PDB A Language Percentage 1 Detailed Design PDB for DB B Language Percentage 1 Output DB to Less A Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Topic A Integration Topic DB Language Percentage 1 Start to TST Language Percentage 1 System Topic DB B 9 Remarker Percentage 1 System Topic DB Topic Administration Percentage 1 System Topic DB Topic A	Sample input: Output Deer Friendly	Sample input. Output Deer Friendin Development Phase s of holivers factores to the factors of households of the factors of the factors of households of the factors of the facto	Simple input. Output Deer friendly Development Phase F of Software facures to 8 4 Languages used as a Percent of Item 8 inTutal int. 2003 Preliminary Designationstrate Award to PDB: A Language Percentage 1 Detailed Designation Office Designation Office Designation Office Designatio	Simple Input. Output Door Friendly	Simple Laput Output Deer Friendly	Simple input Output Deer Friendly	Simple Input. Output Door Friendly	Simple Input. Output Door Friendly	Simple input. Output Door Friendly Development Phone F of Software Injury to Interactive Complex Requirements Severe Impair Development Phone F of Software Injury to A Languages used as a Percent of Item B inJutal is 100% Precipionary Designationstract Award to PDB* A Language Percentage % Detailed DesignaPDB is 100% B Language Percentage % Use & DebugicDB to Test & Lang Start Language Percentage % System Test Dix Jot Start to PVT Language Percentage % System Test Dix Jot Start Language A Househie Lude From Similar Projects The factors on baracteristics **Total All Interaction Projects The factors of baracteris	Sumple input Output Deer Friendly
Simple limput Output Deer Friendly	Sample input: Output Deer Friendly	Sample input. Output Deer Friendin Development Phase s of holivers factores to the factors of households of the factors of the factors of households of the factors of the facto	Simple input. Output Deer friendly Development Phase F of Software Salvare to the salvare	Simple Input. Output Door Friendly	Simple Laput Output Deer Friendly	Simple input Output Deer Friendly	Simple Input. Output Door Friendly	Simple Input. Output Door Friendly	Simple input. Output Door Friendly Development Phone F of Software Injury to Interactive Complex Requirements Severe Impair Development Phone F of Software Injury to A Languages used as a Percent of Item B inJutal is 100% Precipionary Designationstract Award to PDB* A Language Percentage % Detailed DesignaPDB is 100% B Language Percentage % Use & DebugicDB to Test & Lang Start Language Percentage % System Test Dix Jot Start to PVT Language Percentage % System Test Dix Jot Start Language A Househie Lude From Similar Projects The factors on baracteristics **Total All Interaction Projects The factors of baracteris	Sumple input Output Deer Friendly
Interactive (complex Requirements Severe logic) 8 4 canguages used on a Percent of (com 8 influent i 100%) A canguage Percentage % Octavised Design PDB (c. DB canguage) B canguage Percentage % ode & Design PDB (c. DB canguage) - canguage Percentage % ode & Design PDB (c. DB canguage) - canguage Percentage % Tour & lategration (c. Est & lategration) in (c. Starr in PV) - canguage Percentage % System Test (c. EST & contract End canguage) - R & Remable Code From Similar Projects - Tour Rediffication Required - Frozer: - For Rediffication of Congression	Interactive complex Requirements Severe (appet) 8 4 unanguage used as a Percent of Item 8 (-Tutal 1 (00%)) A unanguage Percentage % Detailed Design-PDB to DB 8 unanguage Percentage % Under 6 Design-PDB to DB 1 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 1 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 2 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 3 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 4 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 5 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 5 under 6 Design-PDB to DB 6 Percentage % Under 6 Design-PDB to DB 6 Percentage % Under 6 Design-PDB to DB 6 Percentage % Under 6 Design-PDB 7 under 6 Design-PDB 8 under 6 Design-PDB 8 under 6 Design-PDB 6 of DB 6 Design-PDB 7 under 6 Design-PDB 7 under 6 Design-PDB 8 under 6 Design-PDB 7 under 6 Design-PDB 8 under 6 Design-PDB 8 under 6 Design-PDB 8 under 6 Design-PDB 9 under 6	Tell Modelication Presentation	Interactive complex Requirements Severe impair & disanguages used as a Percent of Item 8 influtal 1.00% A languages used as a Percent of Item 8 influtal 1.00% B language Percentage % Detailed Design-POR to Test & lates Start - useguage Percentage % Use & DebugicDR to Test & lates Start - useguage Percentage % Test & Integration** in 1 Start to PUT - useguage Percentage % System Test IDK FOT to contract Land **The Percentage % System Test I	interactive complex Requirements Severe Lagrati & unaguages used as a Percent of Item 8 in Tutal in 1003 A unaguage because Percentage 2 Detailed Design Control to PDB: B unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to LDB unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage Percentage 3 Tour & Internal to PDB: unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage 1 Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage 1 Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start In FCT unaguage 1 Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start In FCT Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start In FCT System fort IN FCT to contract End The Redification Required	interactive complex Requirements Severe Lapaci. & unaguage used as a Percent of Item 8 in Tutal 1 (00%) A unaguage Designation of the Building of the DB in Tutal 1 (00%) Business of the Designation of the DB in Tutal 1 (00%) Business of the Designation of the DB in Tutal 1 (00%) Business of the Designation of the DB in Tutal 1 (00%) Business of the Designation of the DB in Tutal 1 (00%) Business of the DB in	interactive complex Requirements Severe (appli) & disagnages used as a Percent of Item B in Total in 100% A language percent of Percentage % Deteried Design Position Percentage % Object of Design Position Percen	interactive complex Requirements Severe Lagrati & unaguages used as a Percent of Item 8 in Tutal in 1003 A unaguage because Percentage 2 Detailed Design Control to PDB: B unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to LDB unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage Percentage 3 Tour & Internal to PDB: unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage 1 Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start unaguage 1 Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start In FCT unaguage 1 Percentage 3 Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start In FCT Use & Debugg CDB to Lost & Lates Start In FCT System fort IN FCT to contract End The Redification Required	interactive complex Requirements Severe capacit B disanguages used as a Percent of Item 8 in Tutal 1 (001) A songuage	interactive complex Requirements Severe capacit Businguages used as a Percent of Item 8 in Tutal 1 (00%) A songuage Percentage % Detailed Design-DOB to 100% Detailed Design-DOB to 100% Businguage Percentage % Ode & DebugicDOB to 100% & acquired Start of Percentage % Ode & DebugicDOB to 100% & acquired Percentage % Ode & DebugicDOB to 100% & 1 Start to PUT of the Advance of Percentage % Ode & DebugicDOB to 100% & 1 Start to PUT of the Advance of the Form Start of Put of the Advance of the Form Start of Percentage % Ode A	Interactive complex Requirements Severe (mpair) & d. unaguages used as a Percent of Item 8 (-Tutal 1 (00%)) A. unaguage
B & Languages used as a Percent of Item B :-Tutal F :00% A Language Percentage Contained Design-PDB in DB B Language Percentage Country Design-PDB in DB Language Country DB Language Count	# # uniqueges used as a Percent of lives # initial ini	B & Languager Leed as a Percent of Licen B LiTutal F 100% A Languager Percentage % Detailed Design-PDB Lot .DB B Languager Percentage % Under & Debug/CDB to Less & lateg Start Languager Percentage % Tear & Jaregration** a L Start in PCT Languager Percentage % System Test DK FOT Languager in PCT Languager Percentage % System Test DK FOT Languager & System Test DK FOT Languager & Cher factors or DarkstersElice T of Modification Pequired	### B disanguage used as a Percent of Item # Interior 100% Precentage	A conguege vard on a Percent of Item B 1/Jucal 1 (00%) A conguege Percentage % Described Described to DB 10	A senguage per ent of item 8 officer to 1003	# 4 unaguages used as a Percent of Item # Inter * 100% Precentage % Described Describe	A conguege vard on a Percent of Item B 1/Jucal 1 (00%) A conguege Percentage % Described Described to DB 10	A conguege vard as a Percent of Item B . Tutal * 100% A conguege Percentage 1 Detailed Design PDB to .DB B conguege Percentage 1 Under a Design PDB to .DB conguege Percentage 1 Under a Design PDB to .DB conguege Percentage 1 Under a Design PDB to .DB conguege Percentage 1 Under a Design PDB to .DB conguege Percentage 1 Under a Design PDB to .DB conguege Percentage 1 Under a Design PDB to .DB some a Design PDB to .DB to a DB to a D	A Languager vard on a Percent of Item 8 - Tutal 1 - 100% Precisionary Designation Designation Amend to PDB - A Languager Percentage 1 Designation Desi	# # Languages used as a Percent of Deem # Indicator 100% Precentage Designation Designation Poet Designation Poet # Language Percentage Designation D
A sanguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design PDB to DB B sanguage Percentage 1 ode & DebugiCDB to Test & size Start ode & DebugiCDB to Test & size Start ode & DebugiCDB to Test & & DebugiCDB	Asequege	A sanguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design-FDR to .DR B sanguage Percentage 1 ude & DebugiCDR to Test & lateg Start - sanguage Percentage 1 Test & lategration To Start in FCT - sanguage Percentage 1 System Test 10k IGT to contract End 8.9 Neuroble Lude From Similar Projects the Required	A sanguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design-FDB to .DB B sanguage Percentage 1 ude & DebugiCDB to Test & ateg Start - sanguage Percentage 1 Test & lategration Test & ateg Start - sanguage Percentage 1 Test & lategration Test & start in FCT - sanguage Percentage 1 System Test 10k FQT to contract End 8 9 Neusable Lude From Similar Projects The Required	A -enginge Percentage 1 Detailed Design.PDB to DB B lenginge Percentage 1 ude à GebugicDB to Test à lateg Start lenginge Percentage 1 Test à lategretion? Il Start to PUT lenginge Percentage 1 System Test DK JOT to contract End 1 9 housable cude From Similar Projects the Required	A -anguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design.PDB to .DB B language Percentage 1 Use & GeologicDB to Test & lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Test & lategretion Test & Start to PUT Language Percentage 1 System Test ICK_FOT to contract End B 9 Nousable Lude From Station Projects the Required	A maguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design.PDB to .DB B maguage Percentage 1 Use & GeologicDB to Test & Integ Start maguage Percentage 1 Test & Integretion Test & Start to FUT manguage Percentage 1 System Test ICK_EGT to contract End # Newsable use From Statist Projects ###################################	A -enginge Percentage 1 Detailed Design.PDB to DB B lenginge Percentage 1 ude à GebugicDB to Test à lateg Start lenginge Percentage 1 Test à lategretion? Il Start to PUT lenginge Percentage 1 System Test DK JOT to contract End 1 9 housable cude From Similar Projects the Required	A -enginer Percentage 1 Detailed Design PDB to .DB B lenguage Percentage 1 ode & DebugiCDB to Test & later Start lenguage Percentage 1 Test & Integration Test & Start to PCT lenguage Percentage 1 System Test DK IGT to contract End 1 of Modification Required	A -enguage Percentage 1 Detailed Design-PDR to .DR B language Percentage 1 ode & DebugiCDR to Test & lateg Start language Percentage 1 Test & Integration to 1 Start to FCT language Percentage 1 System Test like Egy to contract End 1 of Medification Required	A sequege Percentage 1 Detailed Design-PDB to DB B sequege Percentage 1 Octaved Design-PDB to DB sequege Percentage 1 Test & Integration to 1 Start to 1971 sequege Percentage 1 System Test DB JGT to soptract Lad 1 9 househir under from Similar Projects the Percentage System Test DB LGT to soptract Lad 1 of Redification Pequired Project 9 of DBLOG Design under integration
B - sequege Percentage 1 ode & GebugiCDB to Test & lateg Start - sequege Percentage 1 Test & lategration** a 1 Start to 197 - sequege Percentage 2 System Test 10c 197 to contract End 8 9 Remarks Lude From Similar Projects the Sequered Test Recification Required Frozett 6 of DSLOC Genum administration	B Language Percentage 1 ode & DebugiCDR to Test & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Test & lategration: " - 1 Start to PUT Language System Test ICK TOT La Contract End Tot Rediffication Pequired Project 6 of DSLOG Design ode integration	B usaguage Percentage 1 ude à DebugiCDR to lest à lateg Start desguage Percentage 1 Teat à lategration " à l'Atart in FUT senguage Percentage 1 System feet lik IQT su contract End 5 9 Reusable Lude From Similar Projects Tet Modification Pequired	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & DebugiCDR to Test & uteg Start Language Percentage 1 Test & lategration ** 0 Start to FUT Language Percentage 1 System Test like IQT to contract End 5 9 Reusable Lude From Station Projects Test Modification Projects Test Modification Projects	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & GebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Leanguage Percentage 1 Feat & lategration 1 Start to FG Language Percentage 1 System Test DK 107 to Contract End 1 9 Reseable Lode From Similar Projects Test Contract End 2 of Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & DebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Feet & lategration 7 it Start to FUT Language Percentage 1 System Test DK FOT La Contract End 8 9 househie Lude From Similar Projects Test Contract End 2 of Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & GebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Percentage 1 System Test & Lateg Start in PCT Language Percentage 1 System Test DK 107 to Contract End 8.9 Reseable Lude From Similar Projects Test Test Test Test Test Test Test Te	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & GebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Leanguage Percentage 1 Feat & lategration 1 Start to FG Language Percentage 1 System Test DK 107 to Contract End 1 9 Reseable Lode From Similar Projects Test Contract End 2 of Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Under & DebugicOR to lest & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Peach lategration in 1 Start to 157 Language Percentage 1 System foot like 197 to contract End 1.9 Remarks under from Similar Projects The Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Under & DebugiCDR to lest & uteg Start Lead a largered Loss to 1 Start to 107 Lead anguage Percentage 1 System Test Dig Log Loss to 107 Lead anguage Loss to 107 Lead anguag	B usaguage Percentage 1 ude à DebugiCDR to Test à lateg Start usaguage Percentage 1 Test à lategration " à Start to FDT usaguage System Test 10k JQT to contract End System Test 10k JQT to contract End ther factors or haracteristics 1 of Rediffication Pequired Projett 6 of DSLOC Design use integration
B - sequege Percentage 1 ode & GebugiCDB to Test & lateg Start - sequege Percentage 1 Test & lategration** a 1 Start to 197 - sequege Percentage 2 System Test 10c 197 to contract End 8 9 Remarks Lude From Similar Projects the Sequered Test Recification Required Frozett 6 of DSLOC Genum administration	B Language Percentage 1 ode & DebugiCDR to Test & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Test & lategration: " - 1 Start to PUT Language System Test ICK TOT La Contract End Tot Rediffication Pequired Project 6 of DSLOG Design ode integration	B usaguage Percentage 1 ude à DebugiCDR to lest à lateg Start desguage Percentage 1 Teat à lategration " à l'Atart in FUT senguage Percentage 1 System Teat lik IQT su contract End 5 9 Reusable Lude From Similar Projects Tet Modification Pequired	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & DebugiCDR to Test & uteg Start Language Percentage 1 Test & lategration ** 0 Start to FUT Language Percentage 1 System Test like IQT to contract End 5 9 Reusable Lude From Station Projects Test Modification Projects Test Modification Projects	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & GebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Leanguage Percentage 1 Feat & lategration 1 Start to FG Language Percentage 1 System Test DK 107 to Contract End 1 9 Reseable Lode From Similar Projects Test Contract End 2 of Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & DebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Feet & lategration 7 it Start to FUT Language Percentage 1 System Test DK FOT La Contract End 8 9 househie Lude From Similar Projects Test Contract End 2 of Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & GebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Percentage 1 System Test & Lateg Start in PCT Language Percentage 1 System Test DK 107 to Contract End 8.9 Reseable Lude From Similar Projects Test Test Test Test Test Test Test Te	B Language Percentage 1 Ude & GebugicOB to Test & Lateg Start Leanguage Percentage 1 Feat & lategration 1 Start to FG Language Percentage 1 System Test DK 107 to Contract End 1 9 Reseable Lode From Similar Projects Test Contract End 2 of Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Under & DebugicOR to lest & Lateg Start Language Percentage 1 Peach lategration in 1 Start to 157 Language Percentage 1 System foot like 197 to contract End 1.9 Remarks under from Similar Projects The Modification Required	B Language Percentage 1 Under & DebugiCDR to lest & uteg Start Lead a largered Loss to 1 Start to 107 Lead anguage Percentage 1 System Test Dig Log Loss to 107 Lead anguage Loss to 107 Lead anguag	B usaguage Percentage 1 ude à DebugiCDR to Test à lateg Start usaguage Percentage 1 Test à lategration " à Start to FDT usaguage System Test 10k JQT to contract End System Test 10k JQT to contract End ther factors or haracteristics 1 of Rediffication Pequired Projett 6 of DSLOC Design use integration
System Test Dix 197 to contract Lad 8 9 Remeable Code From Similar Projects the Projects the Factors or baracteristics 2 of Medification Required Project 6 of DSLOK Design and integration	System feet DK 197 to contract End 8 9 Remember code From Similar Projects their factors or haracteristics 2 of Medification Project Project 6 of DBLOC Design ode integration	System feet Dix Igt to contract End 9 Newsonic code From Similar Projects their factors or haracteristics 2 of Modification Property	System Test DK IGT to contract End 4 Neumable Code From Similar Projects Tel Modification Property Tel Modification Property	Percentage 1 System Test Dix FQT to contract End 1 9 Newseble code From Similar Projects their factors on paralteristics 2 of Modification Required	System Test Dix Egt to contract End 9 Newsenie Lude From Similar Projects their facture or harmiteristics 2 of Modification Required	System Test DK Egt to contract End 4 Secure Test DK Egt to contract End 5 Secure Test DK Egt to contract End Therefactors or harmteristics	Percentage 1 System Test Dix FQT to contract End 1 9 Newseble code From Similar Projects their factors on paralteristics 2 of Modification Required	System Test DK IGT to contract End 1 9 Newseble code From Similar Projects their factors or haracteristics 2 of Modification Required	System feet lik lift to contract Lad O howeable code from Similar Projects T of Modification Required	System Test Dig Jot Contract End B 9 Househir cude from Similar Projects therefactors or haracteristics 1 of Modification Project Project 6 of DSLOC Design ode integration
\$ of DSUX Design and other factors or parameterstics	1 of Modefication Project Therefactors or haracteristics 2 of Modefication Project # of DSLOC Design ode niegration	8 9 Neusable Lude From Similar Projects : their factors or parasteristics : T of Modification - Pequired : T of Modification - T of Modi	8 9 November Code From Similar Projects : their factors on parasteristics : their factors on parasteristics : T of Modification Property	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	8 9 housable Lude From Similar Projects	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Project Therefactors or baracteristics 2 of Modification Project # of DSLOC Design ode integration
\$ of DSUX Design and other factors or parameterstics	1 of Modefication Project Therefactors or haracteristics 2 of Modefication Project # of DSLOC Design ode niegration	8 9 Neusable Lude From Similar Projects : their factors or parasteristics : T of Modification - Pequired : T of Modification - T of Modi	8 9 November Code From Similar Projects : their factors on parasteristics : their factors on parasteristics : T of Modification Property	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	8 9 housable Lude From Similar Projects	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Project Therefactors or baracteristics 2 of Modification Project # of DSLOC Design ode integration
T of Modification Required Project 6 of DSLOX Design and Congression	2 of Redification Paguired Project d of DSLOC Design ode (otegration	I of Modellication Dequired	T of Modelication Dequired	1 of Modification Property	1 of Modification Required	T of Modification Required	1 of Modification Property	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required Project d of DSLOG Design ode integration
T of Maintration Required	T of Modification Page red Project # of DSLOC Design ode integration	1 of Modification Required	1 of ModifiCation Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Required	1 of Modification Pequired Project 6 of DSLOC Design use integration
Project # of DSLOX Design ode Alegration	Project # of DSLOC Deauge ode otegrat.os	A second	A second	A second	A second		A second	A	A	Project # of DSLOC Design .ode .otegration
				······································	······································		······································			
1 1	1 1									1 1 1
1 1 1										1 1 1
	the contract of the contract o				the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o		the contract of the contract o	the state of the s	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
and the same of th	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
in west time	Topic tests	Topic State	Topic Services	Townstation the state of the st	The state of the s	Total California Control California Californ	Townstation the state of the st	The second state of the se	The second state of the se	an agreed to the second
Do Gent title religion For Description	Description Profession Profession	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	To development Sprinteration	To the second se	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	To development Sprinteration	To development Spring to a to a series of the series of th	The service pages for the state of the service pages for the servi	The second section of the second seco
Document State Procedures Specification Professionation	The second section and the second section and the second section sec	Product Specification	Profession Agents Springer Spr	The second state of the second	The serving se	To see the second secon	The second state of the second	The second state of the second	The second state of the second	P. Development Specification
Disconnection Disconnection Figure East	Profession Profes	Profession	Profession	Profession The profession Profession	The second state of the second	Profession Profes	Profession The profession Profession	Product Specification Profess Feel	Product Sperification Fig. Freduct Sperification	Pic Product Specification Pic Product Specification Pic Product Specification
Decomposition Decomposition Procedure Specification Procedure Specification Test Procedures	Or amentation A Pages Bat 1 / Att. P. Development Specification P. Product Specification Fest Finingures Fast Finingures	or amentation A displace	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	A secondation To secondation To secondation To secondation This secondation Test France Specification Test France Specification	Programment State	To amendation The control of the co	A secondation To secondation To secondation To secondation This secondation Test France Specification Test France Specification	A page Est 1 (Ass.) P. Proper Specification PST Product Specification PST Product Specification	The magnitude of the state of t	The second section and the second section and the second section secti
Suppose Company of the Company of th	Description	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	Properties of the state of the	Pages East 1 Ass. Property Specification Pages France Pa	To agentation To agent Specification For Product Specification	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	Pages East 1 Ass. The Product Specification Pages France	The second section of Pages & Section 1 Assume the second section of Pages & Section 1 Assume the second section of Pages & Section 1 Assume the section of the second section of the sect	The second state of the second	An amendancy in The server representation to
Documentation Document Specification Pro Development Specification Pro Product Specification Test Figure Test Figure Test Apple Test Apple Test Apple	Description A 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	Product Specification Professional Specification Profession Specification Specification Profession Specification Specification Profession Specification Specificatio	Professional Specification Professional Specification Profession Specification S	To agentation To agentation To agentation To agentation To agent Specification To agent Specification To agent Specification The agent Froncoures	Product Specification Fig. Pr	To agentation To age	To agentation To agentation To agentation To agentation To agent Specification To agent Specification To agent Specification The agent Froncoures	To agentation To age	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	The second state of the second
Documentation Document ratio Professionation Professionation Test Franchise Test Apper	Or Ammentation A	Programman Springers Springers Programman Programman Programman Programman Springers Programman Springers Programman Prog	T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	Programment of the Committee of Pages East 1 (A); Programment Specification Pages From Power Specification Pages From Power Pages From Power Pages From	Programment of the state of the	To amendation To amendation To amendation Proceedings of Proceedings on Proceedings of August Proceedings of August Proceedings on Proceed	Programment of the Committee of Pages East 1 (A); Programment Specification Pages From Power Specification Pages From Power Pages From Power Pages From	Programment of the state of the	Toward Color	on amendances Professional Specification Professional Specification Professional Specification For Profession For Profess
Some agent of the second secon	Description # of Pages Est 1 (Att) Processingment Specification Professingment Specification [est Fig. Fest Fig. Fest Apper Fest	The second police of the second of the secon	Description 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	To agentation To agentation To development Specification For France	To agentation To agentation To development Specification Professional Specification	To describe the second	To agentation To agentation To development Specification For France	To agentation To agentation To development Specification For France East to Associate the second	The service of the se	The second sector of the second secon
The state of the s	The second state of the second	The second system and the second system of the seco	momentation The state of the s	Toward Street Spring Street St	Toward Start Spring Start Star	To demonstration To demonstra	Toward Street Spring Street St	Toward Street	The second state of the second	on amenia () () () Decomposition of Pages Est of Ass. Product Specification Profess Products Past Products
<u> </u>		1 1	• • •	• • •	• • •	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	
		Project # of DSLOC Design ude otegration	Frojer of DSLOC Design ode Otegration	rouge: # of DSLOX Design ode otegration	Frojet # of DSLOX Design ode otegration	Projett g of DSLOC Design ode otegration	rojet # of DSLOX Design ade alegration	rolet for DSLOX Design ode otegration	Fro. pt	
1 1	1 1 1									The state of the s
		1 1 1	• • •	• • •	• • • •	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	the state of the s
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					The state of the s	The state of the s	
1 1										1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	the contract of the contract o				the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o		the contract of the contract o	the state of the s	
	the contract of the contract o				the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o		the contract of the contract o	the state of the s	
	the contract of the contract o				the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o		the contract of the contract o	the state of the s	
	the contract of the contract o				the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o		the contract of the contract o	the state of the s	
	the contract of the contract o	the state of the s		the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o	the contract of the contract o	the state of the s	
		1 1	• • •	• • •	• • •	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	the second secon
	11	i i i	• • •	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1	1 1 1	
		1 1 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • •	• • •	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1	
		1 1 1					1 1 1		1 1 1	the second secon

ceres personer andrews mercesse present processes

Figure 3.1-4 Computer Program Configuration Item Summary Data Form

the cost models, the software size is allocated to different functional operations, source statement mixes, programming languages, and operational modes. These size profiles can also be used for developing analogies. Several software quality measures required by the models are included. Additionally, two prospective measures of software quality, that is, documentation page count and failure history, are collected for future research.

This format is prepared for each CPCI in the system and can be used for additions to the data base or to collect cost model input parameters.

3.1.4 Resource Expenditure Data

This format (Figure 3.1-5) is designed to collect data or, amprover resource expenditures for a project by CPCI, WBS

RESOURCE EXPENDITURE PATA	MRS ELEN/CPC1
	MC
Project Name	26
Latest Heath of Actuals 3 Units of Manpower	2'
	28
VBS ELEMENT	1
un ceci	1 10
DATTILS)
rma	32
MITRACT AWARD))
)=
	35
,	36
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
;	. 16
,)9
	40
	6)
v	<u> </u>
A	•)
	<u> </u>
· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- 1
- 1	**
	•!
- 13	
•	36
	32
	<u> </u>
- 10	<u>}</u>
··	26
<u> </u>	1
	<u> </u>
ال المالية الم	10

Figure 3.1-5 Resource Expenditure Data Form

element or other aggregation of data. For this initial data collection effort, it allows the data provider to supply information to the lowest level of detail that is available. Aggregation of the data to appropriate levels for inclusion in the data base was performed after the receipt of the formats. If this format is used for collection of data on future efforts, the WBS items to be included can be specifically identified as a requirement.

とのは、というととなり、「いちかんなか」 いっぱんのいと しょうしょうにん たい

The format is structured to collect data by month relative to the contract award or project start date. For ongoing projects, the last month for which actual data are available is indicated; estimated data are used for the balance of the development project. In order to minimize the data conversion required on the part of the format preparer, manpower data can be included in any units as long as the basis for the units is identified, for example, manmonths representing 152 manhours of effort.

base and up to five WiD elements with 60 months of data can be entered on each form. It does not nontain any entries required for cost model inputs; however, it will likely be useful for updating cost estimates for ongoing project.

3.1.5 CPCI Function and Sizing Data Detail

This format (Figure 3.1-6) is designed to collect soft-ware size and functional data to the lowest level of detail available. It constitutes a decomposition of a CPCI down to the module level. The function definition is selected from a table of electronics systems software functions contained in the instructions. Since this table is not all-inclusive, the format preparer can specify a unique function category for an element.

CPCI NAME:

CPC NAME	MODULE OR	REUSED CODE LITTLE OR NO MODIFICATION	REUSED CODE EXTENSIVE MODIFICATION	NEW CODE	FUNCTION	SIZI	NG # OF WORDS	PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE
	 	.=	: ::: :::: : : : :	<u>-</u> ;	<u> : - :</u>			
		(- - -	
		j 					:	
					,			
	<u> </u>							

Figure 3.1-6 Computer Program Configuration Item Function and Sizing Data Detail Form

Each module is characterized according to its degree of novelty to clarify the magnitude of the development task:

- Reused Code little or no modification
- Reused Code extensive modification
- New Code.

To increase the flexibility of the data base, sizing data are collected in two ways:

- Lines of source code, excluding comments
- Words of CPU memory occupied.

Size information is requested in lines of source code because that is the measure currently used by most models. Words of memory occupied are also requested so that object instructions can be estimated, since most sizing analyses performed during system development are done in memory words. Moreover, PRICE-S requires size data as executable machine instructions, which can be more accurately derived from the memory word count than from lines of source code. The language in which each subelement is programmed is also identified on this format.

This format is prepared for each CPCI and documents each subelement into which the CPCI is decomposed. The primary purpose of these data are for use in software sizing models. They can also be used to cross-check the size distributions on the CPCI Summary Format and to evaluate the memory utilization efficiency of different languages.

3.1.6 Data Collection Format Instructions

The data collection format instructions begin with a description of the objective of the data collection effort and the five data collection formats. A separate section of instructions for each format follows with item-by-item instructions. Definitions of specific data items are part of the item instruction, if appropriate. Subjective items include a detailed set of guidelines drawn from cost model instructions to facilitate consistent evaluations across a range of projects.

A glossary defines any software engineering terms used in the instructions, as well as software development milestones and reviews. This glossary was developed using the draft MIL-STD-SDS (Ref. 29) as the primary source of definitions; this glossary should be revised to reflect the final version of the standard when it is issued. Additional items were taken from

Refs. 25 and 30 through 33. Finally, Refs. 2, 3, 4 and 5 were used for model specific definitions.

The instruction package also contains a table of standard software function categories, developed under the SARE effort, to be used in completing the CPCI Function and Sizing Detail Format and the recommended work breakdown structure to be used for the Resource Expenditure Form.

Although the instruction package is sizable, it is the minimum required to insure consistent interpretation of the data requirements. It eliminates much of the additional explanation that is given verbally when detailed instructions are not available in writing. The initial feedback from industry has been that the package is quite clear and well-conceived. Residual questions from participants in the data collection have been relatively few.

3.2 COLLECTION APPROACHES

Three different approaches were selected for the initial data collection:

- Method 1 -- Data collection forms completed by defense contractor
- Method 2 -- Data forms completed by program office
- Method 3 -- Data forms completed by TASC analyst using program office documentation.

The relative efficiency of these approaches was evaluated when the data collection formats were completed. Method 1 depends on the willingness of companies to divulge proprietary data about Government software projects to a third party. On this project, cooperation of the defense industry was obtained through the use of previously established professional contacts. Because of TASC's corporate policy of not contracting with defense contractors, the participants had no concerns about a possible conflict of interest. Typically, after the initial contact was established and a commitment to furnish data secured, constant follow-up activity was required to ensure success. This follow-up activity included a visit to the contractor facility to gather feedback about the data collection formats, to identify areas of ambiguity, and to evaluate the quality of the data furnished. Each participant was offered an aggregated, non-attributable tabulation of the data furnished by all of the participants for use in evaluating his own data.

Method 2 is dependent on establishing contact in the program office with an appropriate individual familiar with the software effort for the project. The reward offered for participation, that is, improved software cost estimating support in the future, is less tangible for this approach. Therefore, the follow-up activity must be even greater than with the first approach. Since the data sources at the program office are limited primarily to the existing data reporting items, the program office contact must interact extensively with the development contractor, especially for personnel characteristic and manpower utilization data.

Method 3 is dependent on the quality and completeness of documentation available for a project. Since the analyst performing the data extraction is not usually familiar with the program, the process can be very time consuming and not all of the data elements required are available in the documentation. Therefore, additional effort was required to obtain missing data from the program office or the software developer.

All three approaches were used on this effort, although not with the same emphasis. The majority of the data was obtained through the defense contractors, because they have more direct access to the data, minimizing the potential for errors and misinterpretation. Table 3.2-1 summarizes each approach with its prerequisites, advantages and disadvantages based on the results of this effort.

3.3 DATA BASE MAINTENANCE AND GROWTH

The data collected under this effort is documented in Volume II of this report. Although it provides a solid basis for initial analysis and model calibration, the continued evolution of the software development process and the need for additional data points to permit more narrow definition of homogeneous groups requires a dynamic data base. Opportunities currently exist for immediate additions to the data base; however, they must be supplemented with a mechanism for regular data collection during the system acquisition process.

3.3.1 Data Collection Methodology

There are four methods that can be employed for adding projects to the data base created under this initial effort:

- Use the final version of the data collection package developed under this effort "as is" (Appendix B)
- Create a formal Data Item Description (DID) from the collection package developed under this effort
- Formally modify existing or planned data item descriptions to include the data elements specified in the data base design

TABLE 3.2-1
DATA COLLECTION APPROACH COMPARISON

ESSENT DESCRIPTION OF SECRETARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF

АРРКОАСН	PREREQUISITES	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Method 1 - Development Contractor as Primary Source	Established personal contacts in industry Guaranteed anonymity to data source Independent data collector Benefit to data source	Better quality and more detailed data Contractor charges cost to overhead	Difficult to obtain timely response Frequent follow-up by data collector Practical for completed projects only No calibration for specific contractors
Method 2 - Government Program Office as Primary Source	Established working relationship with program office Contractual relationship between program office and development contractor Program office personnel with experience on project	Practical for on-going or recently completed programs Allows model calibration for a specific contractor	Not effective with non- ESD program offices Consumes program office resources Development contractor participation charged to contract Some follow-up by data collector
Method 3 - Deliverable Documentation as Primary Source	High quality and complete documentation	Allows model calibration for a specific con- tractor Uses only data collector resources	Current documentation practices inconsistently applied Additional data required from program office and development contractor Interpretation of data by inexperienced personnel Highly time-consuming for data collector

 Prepare instructions to be used for tailoring existing data items to report data specified in the data base design.

The first method is appropriate for collecting data to derive the input parameters for the cost models used to develop an estimate or to support a source selection and to add completed projects to the data base. This collection package serves as a replacement for ASD Form 169a, since it includes not only the data collected on that form, but also additional data for cost models which are not covered by Form 169a. The last three methods are applicable for collecting data on new projects for the data base or for monitoring performance on those projects.

Implementation of the first two methods is based on the final version of the formats resulting from the feedback from the initial collection effort. If the formats are not going to be used as formal contract data requirement list (CDRL) items, the first method is used. Local form numbers are assigned and the package is ready for use. On the other hand, if the formats are going to be used as contractual deliverables, then they must be formally established as data items within the required review and approval cycle.

The last two methods are implemented by identifying the specific data items that are appropriate for reporting subsets of the data elements contained in the data collection formats. In Ref. 35, the preliminary report for this effort, the following list of data items with recommended changes was presented:

• Cost Performance Reports (DI-F-6000C and DI-F-601C) - Modify/tailor tormat 1 of the Cost Performance Report and the Cost Schedule Status Report to show manpower data for the software WBS elements or

format 4 of the Cost Performance Report to show manpower by WBS rather than functional area

- Program Master Schedule (DI-A-3007 and DI-A-3009) - Identify specific software development milestones at the system and CPCI levels to be included in the schedule submissions
- System Specifications (DI-E-3101A, DI-E-3102A and DI-E-3117) Add a format summarizing mission, functional, hardware component, and software component data
- Software Development Specification (DI-E-3119A) Add a format summarizing the major software functions and the CPCIs
- Software Product Specification (DI-E-3120A) - Require functional categorization by standard category as part of the module descriptions
- Software Sizing and Timing Analysis Report (DI-S-3581) Require sizing information at the module level in source lines of code, as well as CPU memory words; incorporate a format identifying the hardware configuration baseline against which the analysis is made and include information about expansion capability and reserve requirements
- Software Development Plan (R-DID-103) Require a summary format identifying tools and techniques to be used, development computer characteristics and constraints, and an experience and quality profile of personnel assigned to the project.

If these changes are incorporated, most of the data elements required for the data base will be available directly. The balance can be derived through analysis and aggregation of detail data from the reports.

Formal modification of the existing data items will require the full review and approval cycle, while instructions for tailoring the data items can be implemented locally. However, since the Joint Logistics Commanders (JLC) Joint Policy Coordinating Group on Computer Resource Management is in the process of developing revised data item descriptions (Ref. 34) for reporting on software projects, formal modification of existing data items which are to be replaced by the JLC versions is not necessary. Instead, ESD should work to have their requirements incorporated into the JLC versions. Separate action will only be required to modify the cost performance data items. Table 3.3-1 summarizes the recommended changes to the JLC data item descriptions required to maintain the ESD Software Data Base.

The Program Master Schedule data item does not need modification; however, the appropriate milestones and levels of detail required for software must be specified in the contract. The changes to the other data items are required in order to insure that the data are provided consistently from one project to another and can easily be extracted for incorporation into the data base. The summary formats, which are to be added, should be standard formats with detailed instructions equivalent to those prepared under this effort. These formats should be augmented with standard tables of keywords for classifying systems, such as Table B-2 in Appendix B to this report. Table B-2 itself needs to be further refined to include other types of systems.

3.3.2 Additional Data Sources

Since this effort consisted of only an initial collection to develop a basic capability and field test the collection approach, several potential data sources which were identified

TABLE 3.3-1 SOFTWARE DATA ITEMS

DATA ITEM NUMBER	TITLE	CURRENT SOFTWARE DATA CONTENTS	RECOMMENDED CHANGES
DI-S-X101	System/Segment Specification	Major system functions Hardware/software inter- relationships Interface requirements (Internal/External) Performance requirements Programming language Compiler/assembler	Require a summary format with: Software Development Project Summary Data Form, Items 1, 2, 3 Development and Target Computer Data Form, Item 1 CPCI Summary Data Form, Items 5, 6, 7
DI-A-X103	Software Development Plan	Development resource requirements Development personnel requirements Tools and techniques Design coding and testing methodology Reusable off-the-shelf code	Require a summary format with: Software Development Project Summary Data Form, Items 4,5 Development and Target Computer Data Form, Item 2 CPCI Summary Data Form, Items 4, 8, 9
DI-E-X106	Software Problem/ Change Report	Problem description Cost/schedule impact Component/document affected Origination date	Provide for periodic summarization of individual problem reports by develop- ment phase
DI-E-X107	Software Requirements Specification	CPCI function Programming requirements Sizing and timing requirements Detailed functional requirements Data base requirements	Require a summary format with: Development and Target Computer Data Form, Items 1.9, 1.10, 1.11 CPCI Summary Form, Items 2,8 CPCI Function and Sizing Detail Form, all items

TABLE 3.3-1 SOFTWARE DATA ITEMS (Continued)

DATA LTEM NUMBER	TITLE	CURRENT SOFTWARE DATA CONTENTS	RECOMMENDED CHANGES
DI-E-X108	Interface Requirements Specification	Interface block diagram Software to software interface Hardware to software interface	None Required
DI-E-X109	Software Standards and Procedures Manual	Software development tools Software development methodology	Require a summary format with: Software Development Project Summary Data Form Items 4, 5
D1-E-X110 & D1-E-X114	Software Top Level Design Document Software Product Specification	Functional allocation to unit/module Sizing and timing budget allocation	Require a summary format with: CPCI Summary Data Form, Item 8 Development and Target Computer Data Form, Items 1.9, 1.10, 1.11 CPCI Function and Sizing Detail Form, all items
DI-F-6000C & DI-F-6010	Cost Performance Report Cost/Schedule Status Report	Monthly cost by WBS element Manpower by functional category	Modify cost format to include manpower by WBS
DI-A-3007 & DI-A-3009	Program Master Schedule	Original start & complete milestones Actual start & complete milestones	None Required

during the study were not actively pursued. These sources can be used to substantially increase the size of the data base in the near term.

Although ESD program offices were used as data sources on a limited basis, the bulk of the data was collected from defense contractors in order to concentrate on sources to which ESD does not have easy access. Therefore, ESD cost analysis personnel can collect data directly from those program offices which have ongoing or recently completed programs and were not used as sources during this effort, for example, SPADOC, WIS, and Berlin Radar.

In October 1983, The Aerospace Corporation completed a software sizing survey (Ref. 28) for the Air Force Space Division (SD) which contains size and function data for ten systems. In addition to the sizing data, Aerospace collected many of the same data elements that are included on the Project Summary, CPCI Summary, and Resource Expenditure Forms developed under this effort. Although many of the systems in the SD data base are space-borne, there are similarities in complexity, reliability requirements, documentation, and timing and sizing constraints, as well as the development environment, to many of the embedded systems developed for ESD. A coordinated effort with SD to collect the missing data elements and to establish a data sharing agreement for the future would result in substantial benefits to ESD.

Finally, there are many other organizations within the DoD who are involved in software development and are in the process of developing software data bases. Data sharing agreements with these organizations can yield additional relevant data points for the ESD data base.

4. ADVANCING THE STATE-OF-THE-ART OF SOFTWARE COST ESTIMATION

The development of an ESD software cost data base is only the first step necessary to enhance the software cost estimation capability at ESD. These data can be used to fine tune existing cost estimating techniques and to develop new tools based on ESD experience.

4.1 DATA BASE AUTOMATION

A data base with as many distinct elements per project as the one developed under this effort becomes very unwieldy even when it contains a small number of projects. As the data base grows, the update and maintenance tasks require more effort and data retrieval becomes a tedious, time-consuming task. Manual transfer of data into model calibration or model development format can introduce errors which may invalidate the results. Automation of the data base can eliminate many of these problems and significantly increase the useability of the data base.

The automated data base should have the following capabilities:

- User friendly data entry with error checking
- Data base editing and update

- Automatic data base back-up
- Keyword search and retrieval
- Input file generation for statistical packages and software cost estimating models.

The keyword search and retrieval system coupled with the ability to generate input files to models will minimize the resources required to assemble homogeneous groups of data for model validation, calibration, and development.

4.2 COST MODEL VALIDATION AND CALIBRATION

Because cost models, such as PRICE-S and JS-1, are based on specific sets of data that may not be representative of ESD software developments, they should be validated for use by ESD. Using the data base developed under this effort, ESD should evaluate the COCOMO, JS-1, SLIM, and PRICE-S as predictors of cost for software developments representative of ESD experience.

Initially, the ESD data base should be compared with the data used to develop the cost models which are to be validated. The major similarities and differences should be identified to facilitate analysis of model outputs. The input parameters for these models are extracted from the historical data so that the predicted cost and schedule can be compared with the actual cost and schedule data. The results are then analyzed to identify the cause of any anomalies and determine the accuracy of the models. The time-phased resource expenditure data generated by the models should also be compared with the historical data to determine its validity.

If a model is found to be suitable for estimating ESD software development cost and schedule, it is calibrated for homogeneous subsets of the ESD data base.

4.3 ESD-UNIQUE MODEL DEVELOPMENT

The validation effort described in the previous section may result in the identification of serious deficiencies in the commercially available models. If the calibration feature of the models cannot compensate for the differences between ESD developments and the projects represented in the model data bases, the development of a model unique to ESD is required.

Development of the model begins with a statistical analysis of the data base to identify the best predictors of electronics system software development costs. Selection of model variables would concentrate on those data items that are available to the estimator or can reasonably be predicted from historical data. Anyone who has ever developed an estimate is sensitive to problems of data availability to support estimates.

Based on the results of the data base analysis, a comprehensive software cost estimating model would be developed with the following features:

- Cost estimating relationships which account for variations in software development cost due to the characteristics and requirements of the system, to the expected development team profile, and to the development environment
- Historically-based resource expenditure profiles

- Impact assessment of resource constraints
- Technology adjustment factor
- Sensitivity analysis mechanism
- Capability to develop confidence intervals for the estimate
- Cost/schedule risk assessment
- Data base interface for size and technical definition by analogy.

With this tool, a cost estimator could take a detailed technical description of a software development program, determine the software size and technical characteristics by analogy, specify a development environment or use ESD historical environmental characteristics, and predict a software development cost and schedule. He could then perform sensitivity analysis based on different assumptions about the nature of the software, the development environment, and resource constraints. Finally, since the model is specifically tailored to ESD software, he would have greater confidence in the results of the analysis.

4.4 SOFTWARE SIZING METHODOLOGY

Delivered source lines of code continues to be the most often used metric for software cost estimating. Therefore, the quality of an estimate can be significantly improved with better sizing tools.

The ESD cost data base can be used as a verification tool for engineering estimates of software size:

 Using size ranges for categories of software for gross level confidence checks Using a catalog of standard software modules for ESD product categories to validate both the sizing and technical completeness of the engineering estimate.

In addition to confidence checks, the data base can be used to derive a size estimate by matching system functional requirements with the keyword classifications of the elements in the data base. This analogy technique is used at the lowest level of detail, system, CPCI, or module/unit, that the available system definition will allow.

In order to normalize the data among different programming languages and increase the effective size of the data base, the relationship between delivered source lines of code and size in memory words occupied can be used to develop conversion ratios.

4.5 SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE COST MODEL

Although this data collection effort was primarily concerned with software development cost estimating, some preliminary research into software maintenance cost estimating was conducted. Since software maintenance represents a significant portion of the total life-cycle cost of a system, a model for estimating these costs should be developed.

The following technical objectives must be achieved before a model can be developed:

• Definition of the basic elements of the software maintenance process including the software maintenance facility, the maintenance workload, the testing requirements, the configuration control and documentation requirements

- Identification of the potential variables for use in modeling these basic elements of the process
- Identification of ESD computer system characteristics which may be relevant to the maintenance process
- Postulation of the relationships among the element variables and the system characteristics/requirements.

The above activities will form the basis for establishing the maintenance cost data base requirements and appropriate work breakdown structure. Following a data collection effort at Air Force software maintenance facilities, the resulting data base can be analyzed statistically and a model can be developed based on the best predictor variables.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.

A comprehensive data collection package was developed under this effort and refined as a result of the feedback from the initial data collection. In the near-term, this data collection package can be used for obtaining information for completed or ongoing projects and for cost model input parameters.

For the long-term a formalized method for data collection is required to maintain the data base and ensure its continued usefulness. It is recommended that ESD become involved in the current Joint Logistics Commanders effort to revise many of the existing software data items and incorporate summary data formats into those data items. While these revised data items are in the review and approval cycle, the tailored data item approach should be used on software development efforts for which contracts will be awarded in the near-term.

In addition to the data that can be obtained for ESD programs, the size of the data base can be significantly increased through data sharing arrangements with other DoD agencies. The Air Force Space Division would be a good starting point.

The availability of data is the crucial first step tor advancing the state-of-the-art of software cost estimation. Figure 5-1 illustrates a road map for increasing the size of the data base and using it to improve existing techniques, as well as for developing new tools. Future efforts should concentrate on:




Figure 5-1 Software Life-Cycle Cost Estimation Road Map

- Data base automation
- Continued data base growth
- Validation and calibration of existing cost models
- Development of an ESD-unique cost model
- Development of software sizing tools
- Development of a software maintenance cost estimation model.

The potential offered by the data availability makes ESD a leader in the state-of-the-art of software cost estimating.

APPENDIX A

SOFTWARE COST MODEL/DATA COLLECTION FORMAT CROSS REFERENCE TABLES

The following tables cross reference the cost model input parameters to specific items on the data collection formats contained in Appendix B. Many of the items can be input directly into the cost models, while others are derived from several data items using estimator judgement. Validation and calibration activities would require the same input parameters for several homogeneous CPCIs.

TABLE A-1 COCOMO MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS

INPUT PARAMETER	DATA COLLECTION FORMAT REFERENCE
Development Mode Selection	Project Summary Form Items 3.1, 3.2, 3.7,7 CPCI Summary Form Items 6.1A, 8 Development and Target Computer Form Items 1.7, 1.8
Software Size	CPCI Summary Form Items 8.1, 8.9 Function & Sizing Detail Form
Required Software Reliability	CPCI Summary Form Item 5
Data Base Size	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.3
Product Complexity	CPCI Summary Form Item 6
Execution Time Constraint	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.4, 1.6, 1.9B
Main Storage Constraint	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.9, 1.10
Virtual Machine Volatility	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 1.8
Computer Turnaround Time	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.2
Analyst Capability	CPCI Summary Form Item 4.2
Applications Experience	CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1A
Programmer Capability	CPCI Summary Form Item 4.2
Virtual Machine Experience	CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1D
Programming Language Experience	CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1C
Modern Programming Practices	Project Summary Form Item 4 CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1B
Use of Software Tools	Project Summary Form Item 5 CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1E Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.8

TABLE A-1
COCOMO MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

INPUT PARAMETER	DATA COLLECTION FORMAT REFERENCE
Required Development Schedule	Project Summary Form Item 6 CPCI Summary Form Item 3
Development Manmonths	For validation/calibration Resource Expenditure Form
Schedule Duration	For validation/calibration Project Summary Form Item 6 CPCI Summary Form Item 3

TABLE A-2 JS-1 MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS

INPUT PARAMETERS	DATA COLLECTION FORMAT REFERENCE
Software Size	CPCI Summary Form Items 8.1, 8.9 Function & Sizing Detail Form
Interactive Environment Rating	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.4
Resource Rating	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.2
Tool Quality Rating	Project Summary Form Item 5 CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1E Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.8
Project Complexity Values	Project Summary Form Items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 CPCI Summary Form Items 8.4, 8.5, 8.6, 8.9 Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.7, 1.8
Response Requirements	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.5
Source Statement Type Mix	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.6
Development Factor	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.9
Special Display Requirements	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.7
Detailed Definition of Operational Requirements	Project Summary Form Item 8 Estimator Judgement
Real Time Operation	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.5A
CPU Time Constraint	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 1.11
CPU Memory Constraint	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 1.10
First Software Developed on CPU System	CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1D
Concurrent ADP Hardware Development	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.7, 1.8

TABLE A-2

JS-1 MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS (Continued)

INPUT PARAMETERS	DATA COLLECTION FORMAT REFERENCE
Developer Using Remote Computer	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 2.6, 2.7
Development at Operational Site	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 2.3, 2.9
Development Computer Different From Target Computer	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.1, 2.1
Development at Multiple Sites	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 2.5, 2.6, 2.7
First Use of Programming Language	CPCI Summary Form Items 4.1C, 8.8
System Type	CPCI Summary Form Item 5
Documentation Type	CPCI Summary Form Item 7

TABLE A-3
SLIM MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS

INPUT PARAMETERS	DATA COLLECTION FORMAT REFERENCE
Software Size	CPCI Summary Form Items 8.1, 8.9 Function & Sizing Detail From
Percent of Development On-line/Interactive	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 2.2, 2.3E
Proportion of Development Computer Dedicated to Effort	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.9
Proportion of Development Computer Used for Other Work	Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 2.9
Proportion of System Coded in Higher Order Language	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.8
Primary Language Used	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.8
Software System Type	Project Summary Form Items 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 CPCI Summary Form Items 2, 8.4, 8.5
System Level	Project Summary Form Items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 CPCI Summary Form Items 2, 8.9
Target Machine Memory Utilization	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.9A, 1.10
Proportion of Real-Time Code	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.5
Modern Programming Practice Usage	Project Summary Form Item 4 CPCI Summary Form Item 4.1B
Personnel Experience	CPCI Summary Form Items 4.1A, 4.1C, 4.1D, 4.1E, 4.2
State of Technology Factor	Derived By Calibration Using CPCI Summary Form Items 3, 8.1 Resource Expenditure Form

TABLE A-4
PRICE-S MODEL DATA REQUIREMENTS

INPUT PARAMETERS	DATA COLLECTION FORMAT REFERENCE
Project Magnitude	CPCI Summary Form Items 8.1, 8.8, 8.9 Function & Sizing Detail Form Development and Target Computer Data Form Item 1.2
Project Application	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.4
Level of New Design and Code	CPCI Summary From Item 8.9
Resource	Derived by calibration using Project Summary Form Item 8 CPCI Summary Form Items 3, 4.1, 4.2, 8.1, 8.4, 8.8, 8.9 Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1, 2.5
Utilization	Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11
Platform	Project Summary Form Items 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7
Complexity or Schedule	Project Summary Form Item 8 CPCI Summary Form Items 3, 4.1, 4.2 Development and Target Computer Data Form Items 1.7, 1.8, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7
New Design	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.9
New Code	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.9
Maximum Manloading	CPCI Summary Form Items 4.3, 4.4
Mix	CPCI Summary Form Item 8.4
Interface Types	Project Summary Form Item 3.2
Interface Quantities	Project Summary Form Item 3.2

APPENDIX B DATA COLLECTION PACKAGE

This appendix contains the ESD software cost data base data collection package, which consists of a comprehensive set of instructions containing reference tables and a glossary. Five data collection formats are also included.

SOFTWARE DATA COLLECTION FORM INSTRUCTIONS

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this data collection effort is to develop a data base of software cost, schedule, sizing, and technical information for use in cost model validation and calibration, for software sizing, and for cost model development.

There are five different forms used to collect the required data:

Software Development Project Summary Data Form - collects data at the project level to define the project functional and technical characteristics, the development tools and methods available, the project schedule, the documentation required, and the change history. It is prepared for each project for which data is provided.

Development and Target Computer Data Form - collects data for each target computer (operational host) in the system and for the development computer on which the corresponding operational software is developed.

Computer Program Configuration Item Summary Data - collects information at the CPCI level to define the development schedule, the personnel characteristics and constraints, the CPCI size and characteristics, documentation requirements, and the failure/error history during the development. This form is prepared for every CPCI identified on the software development project summary form.

Resource Expenditure Data Form - collects timephased manpower utilization data at the lowest level available for the project.

Computer Program Configuration Item Function and Sizing Data Detail Form - collects software size, function and programming language information at the lowest level available for each CPCI listed on the software development project summary data form.

Detailed instructions for completing the forms are included in the following sections. Attachment A is a glossary of terms used in the forms. Attachment B is a recommended work breakdown structure for software development projects.

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SUMMARY DATA

roject Name:evelopment Contractor/Organization:	
roject Description	
3.1 Mission Description:	
3.2 Major Hardware Interfaces:	
3.3 Major System Functions:	
3.4 Major Software Functions:	
3.5 Number of CPCIs:	
3.5 Number of CPCIs: 3.6 CPCI Names:	
3.6 CPCI Names:	
3.6 CPCI Names:	
3.6 CPCI Names:	
3.6 CPCI Names:	
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User:	pany
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com	pany
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age	pany
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used	pany ncy
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used 4.1 Specification:	pany ncy
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used 4.1 Specification: Functional Procedural English	pany ncy Other:
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used 4.1 Specification: Functional Procedural English 4.2 Design:	pany ncy Other:
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used 4.1 Specification: Functional Procedural English 4.2 Design: Top Down Bottom Up Iterative Enhancem	pany ncy Other:
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used 4.1 Specification: Functional Procedural English 4.2 Design: Top Down Bottom Up Iterative Enhancem Hardest First None Other:	pany ncy Other:
3.6 CPCI Names: Development Contractor	pany ncy Other: ent
3.6 CPCI Names: Bevelopment Contractor	pany ncy Other: ent
3.6 CPCI Names: 3.7 System User: Development Contractor Other Commercial Com Department of Defense Other Government Age Development Methodologies Used 4.1 Specification: Functional Procedural English 4.2 Design: Top Down Bottom Up Iterative Enhancem Hardest First None Other: 4.3 Development: Top Down Bottom Up Iterative Enhancem Hardest First None Other:	pany ncy Other: ent

4.5 Testing:	
Top Down(stubs) Bott	om Up(drivers)
Specification Driven	Structure Driven
None Other:	
4.6 Validation/Verification(Insp	pection):
Peer Review Walk Thr	roughs Proof
None Other:	
4.7 Formalisms:	
Program Design Language(Sp	pecify):
	rts Chapin Charts HOS
Other:	
5. Software Development Tools Used:	
Assembler	Basic Linker
Basic Monitor	Batch Debug Aids
Higher Order Language	Macro Assembler
Compiler	Simple Overlay Linker
Basic Source Editor	Language Independent Monitor
Basic Library Aids	Basic Data Base Aids
Real-time or Timesharing	Extended Overlay Linker
Operating System	Database Management System
Interactive Debug Aids	Simple Programming Support Library
Interactive Source Editor	Virtual Memory Operating System
Database Design Aid	Simple Program Design Language
Performance Measurement	Programming Support Library With
And Analysis Aids	Basic Configuration Management Aids
Set-Use Static Analyzer	Control Flow Static Analyzer
Basic Text Editor & Manager	Program Flow and Test Case Analyzer
File Manager	Full Programming Support Library
Documentation System	Project Control System
Requirements Specification	Extended Design Tools
Language and Analyzer	Automated Verification System
Fault Report System	Crosscompilers
Instruction Set Simulators	Display Formatters
Data Entry Control Tools	Communications Processing Tools
Conversion Aids	Structured Language Tool
Other:	Other:
Other:	Other:

6. Development Schedule

	Original	Actual	Estimated
Project Milestone	Date	Date	<u>Date</u>
Contract Award	44 55-7-77 77-4-15-55-55-5		
System Requirements Review			
System Design Review	-		
Preliminary Design Review	-		
Critical Design Review			
Preliminary Qualification Test			
Formal Qualification Test			
Start CPCI Integration Into System			
Complete CPCI Integration into System			
Start Development Test & Evaluation			
Complete Development Test & Evaluation			
Start Initial Operational Test & Eval			
Complete Initial Operational Test & Eva			
Functional Configuration Audit			
Physical Configuration Audit			
Formal Qualification Review		and the second of	
System Delivery	_		
Documentation			
Document Title	# of Pages	Est'd or	Act'l
System Engineering Management Plan			<u> </u>
Computer Program Development Plan			
System Test Plan			
Other:			
Other:			
Other:		_ * ·	
Other:		/ -	

8. Software Change History

	# of Changes	Est'd DSLOC	Est'd Manpower
Development Phase	Approved	Change +/-	Change +/-
Preliminary Design			
(Contract Award to PDR)			
Detailed Design			
(PDR to CDR)			
Code & Debug			
(CDR to Test & Integ Start)		,	
Test & Integration			
(Test & Integ Start to FQT)			
System Test/IOC			
(FQT to Contract End)			

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SUMMARY DATA FORM INSTRUCTIONS

- Item 1: Enter the name of the project and the date on which this form is being prepared.
- Item 2: Identify the company or organization which is actually performing the software design and development.
- Item 3.1: Briefly describe the overall mission or purpose of the system for which the software is being developed.
- Item 3.2: Identify the major hardware components with which the software will interface, for example, radars, communications equipment, sensors, other embedded computer systems, etc.
- $\underline{\text{Item 3.3}}$: List the major functions performed by the system.
- Item 3.4: List the major functions performed by the software.
- Item 3.5: Identify the number of Computer Program Configuration Items (CPCIs) into which the system is divided.
 - Item 3.6: List the names of each CPCI in the system.
- Item 3.7: Indicate with an X the user for whom the system is being developed.
- Items 4.1-4.7: Indicate with an X all of the software development methodologies and strategies used for each activity on this project.

Item 5: Indicate with an X all of the software development tools used on this project; use the last four items to specify other tools used which are not included in the listing.

Item 6: Enter the original schedule date for each applicable milestone (enter N/A if a milestone is not applicable). Although these milestones represent formal contractual activities in the Department of Defense software acquisition process, many non-defense projects will have milestones which are equivalent to these, e.g., contract award is equivalent to project start and critical design review is equivalent to completion of detail design. If the formal milestones are not required in the project schedule, data for equivalent activities should be used. Definitions of these milestones are provided in Attachment A of these instructions. Unless otherwise indicated, the date should reflect the activity completion date. Where available, enter the actual date of completion for the milestone; for ongoing efforts, enter the current estimate for completion of the milestone.

Item 7: Enter the number of pages for each document listed and specify any additional documentation required for the software at the project level. Indicate with an X in the appropriate column whether the page count is estimated or actual.

Item 8: Enter the number of requirements changes which occurred during each completed development phase, the net increase/decrease in the total system source instruction count and the net increase/decrease in the estimated manpower for the software development effort.

DEVELOPMENT AND TARGET COMPUTER DATA FORM

iarg	get computer	
1.1	Manufacturer: Model Number:	
1.2	2 Main Memory Size in Words: Word Size:	Bits
1.3	3 Maximum Main Memory Size:	
1,4	4 CP ^P Processing Speed:	
1.5	S Reserve Memory Requirement: %	
1.6	b Reserve Timing Requirement: %	
1.7	Concurrent Development with Software: Yes No	
1.8	8 Virtual Machine Volatility:	
	Very Low Low Nominal High Very Hig	gh
1.9	9 Percent Utilization: <51% 51-70% 71-85% 86-95%	•95°
	A. CPU Memory	
	B. Execution Time	
1.10	10 CPU Memory Constraint Evaluation:	
	No Memory Economy Measures Required	
	Some Overlay (se Or Segmentation Required	
	Extensive Overlay And/Or Segmentation Required	
	Complex Memory Management Economy Measures Required	
1.1	11 CPU Time Constraint Evaluation:	
	No Software is CPU Time Constrained	
	·25% of Source Code is Time Constrained	
	<pre>650% of Source Code is Time Constrained</pre>	
	<pre><75% of Source Code is Time Constrained</pre>	
1 11	12 CPCIs Hosted on This Computer:	

	lopment Computer	M o			
2.1	Same as Target Computer: Yes				
	If No, Manufacturer:				
	Difference Between Development and T				
2.2	Turnaround Time:				
	Low (interactive, specify):	Nominal (<4hrs)			
	High (4-12hrs) Very Hi	gh (>12hrs)			
2.3					
	A. Batch	<u> </u>			
	B. Dedicated Processor	<u> </u>			
	C. Test Bed with High Priority	%			
	D. Test Bed with Low Priority				
	E. Interactive	%			
	F. Other:				
2.4	For Interactive Development, Indicat Software Engineers/Programmers per T				
2.5	Number of Development Sites				
2.6	Development Site Locations:				
2.7	Development Computer Location(s):				
2.8	Software Development Tool Usage:				
	Very Low Low Nominal	High Very High			
2.9	Development Computer Resource Availa	bility			

DEVELOPMENT AND TARGET COMPUTER DATA FORM INSTRUCTIONS

- Item 1.1: Identify the manufacturer of the operational system for which this software is being developed. If the computer is an off-the-shelf item, enter the model number.
- Item 1.2: Enter the main memory size in words and indicate the word size in bits. For ongoing projects, this should reflect the current configuration of the computer. For completed projects, this entry should reflect the delivered configuration of the computer.
- Item 1.3: Enter the maximum main memory size in words that can be attained without major modification to the current or delivered computer configuration.
- Item 1.4: Indicate the CPU processing speed in instructions per second.
- Item 1.5: Enter the percent of Item 1.2 which must be left available for expansion/growth after system delivery.
- Item 1.6: Enter the percent of the total processing time which must be left available for expansion/growth after system delivery.
- Item 1.7: Indicate with an X whether the target virtual machine is being developed concurrently with the software.
- Item 1.8: Using the following criteria, indicate with an X the degree of volatility in the design of the virtual machine:

Very Low = No major changes; one minor change every 12 months

Low = Major changes every 12 months; minor changes every month

Nominal = Major changes every 6 months; minor changes every 2 weeks

High = Major changes every 2 months; minor changes every week

Very High = Major changes every 2 weeks; minor changes every 2 days

- $\underline{\text{Item 1.9A}}$: Indicate with an X the maximum percentage of main storage used by any group of CPCIs operating concurrently.
- Item 1.9B: Indicate with an X the maximum percentage of processing time used by any group of CPCIs executing concurrently.
- Item 1.10: Indicate with an X the level of memory conservation measures required to satisfy the reserve memory requirement in Item 1.5.
- Item 1.11: Indicate with an X the percentage of the software that requires special coding effort to enhance timing performance.
- $\underline{\text{Item 1.12}}\colon \ \text{ Enter the names of the CPCIs which are hosted in this computer.}$
- Item 2.1: Indicate with an X whether the development computer is the same as the target operational computer. If the computers are different, identify the manufacturer and

model number of the development computer. Describe any differences between the two computers which would affect the software development effort, e.g., different operating systems, computers, compilers, main memory and timing constraints. Is development of a target computer emulator required?

- Item 2.2: Indicate with an X the average turnaround time for the development computer. If a rating of low applies, specify the approximate response time experienced on the system per computing job, e.g., a unit test or compile.
- Item 2.3: Indicate the percentage of source instructions developed using the specified access modes. Specify any other mode used and its percentage of utilization.
- Item 2.4: For terminals which are readily accessible to members of the development team, indicate the average number of software engineers and programmers per terminal.
- Item 2.5: Enter the number of individual sites where this software is being developed. Indicate any site that is working as a subcontractor to the development contractor.
- Item 2.6: Identify the geographic location (city and state) of each of the development sites.
- Item 2.7: Specify the location of the development computers used to develop this software by each of the development sites.
- Item 2.8: Specify the degree to which the development tools available within the development contractor's organization are used in the development of this software.

Item 2.9: Indicate the percentage of the total development computer capacity that is available for work on this project. This percentage should reflect the impact of operational uses or other developments competing for the use of this resource.

COMPUTER PROGRAM CONFIGURATION ITEM SUMMARY DATA

2. Functiona	. bescript				- Address
3. Schedule					
3.1 Miles	stone Data	9			
			Origin	al Actual	Estimated
CPCI Deve	elopment N	Milestones	Date		Date
Design	Start				
Prelim	inary Des	ign Review			
Develo	pment Spec	rification App	roval		
Critic	al Design	Review			-
Start	Coding/Deb	ougging	41. Carrie Carrie		
Comple	te Coding,	/Debugging			
Start	Informal .	Integration &			
End In	formal Int	tegration & Te			
Prelim	inary Qua.	lification Tes			
Formal	Qualifica	ation Test	_		
Produc	t Specific	cation Approva			
Functi	onal Conf	iguration Audi	t		
Physic	al Configu	uration Audit			
3.2 Sche	dule Acce	leration/Stret	chout Assessm	ent:	
Belo	w 75%	75-85%	86÷130%	131-160%	160%
. Personnel					
4.1 Aver	age Exper	ience			
		ı	mo 1-4mos	4-12mos 1-3yrs	3-6yrs _by
A. A	pplication	n Area			
B. T	echniques	Used			
C. L.	anguages (Used	-		-
D. V	irtual Mad	chine		~ -	
E. S	upport So	ftware/Tools			

4.2	Average Personnel Qu	ality Percentile:	
	0-15%	16-35%	36-55%
	56-75%	76-90%	90-100%
4.3	Manpower Availabilit	y:%	
4.4	Peak Manloading:		
5. Reli	ability Requirement:		
Ve	ry Low Low	Nominal High	Very High
6. Comp	lexity:		
	Very Low	Low	Nominal
	High	Very High	Extra High
7. Qual	ity of Specification		
	Very Precise	Precise	Imprecise
8. Size			
8.1	Deliverable Lines of	Source Code Excludir	ng Documentation:
8.2	Lines of Source Code	Documentation:	-
8.3	Data Base Size in By	tes or Characters:	
8.4	Size Breakdown by Op	peration As a Percent	of Item 8.1(Total = 100%):
	A. Data Storage & Ret	rieval	%
	B. Online Communicati	ons	%
	C. Real-Time Command	& Control	%
	D. Interactive Operat	ions	<u> </u>
	E. Mathematical Opera	itions	%
	F. String Manipulation	on	o /
	G. Operating Systems		۵, (ه
	H. Other:		
	t deal		O; -
8.5	Operational Response	Requirements Distrib	oution As a Percent of
	<pre>Item 8.1(Total =</pre>	100%):	
	A. Real-Time	% B. On-Lir	ne %
	C. Time-Constrained		ime Critical%
			f Item 8.1(Total = 100%):
	A. Logical %	B. Command	% C. Mathematical
	D. Data Manipulation	9/ F 1) a t	ta Daglaration 9

O	. r special bisplay Require	ments.							
	Simple Input/Output	User Friendly							
	Interactive	Complex Requi	rements/Seve	re Impact					
8	.8 Languages Used as a Per	cent of Item 8.1	(Total = 100	%):					
	A. Language:		Percentag	e:	%				
	B. Language:		Percentag	e:	%				
	C. Language:		Percentag	e:	%				
	D. Language:		Percentag	e:	%				
8	.9 Reusable Code From Simi	Reusable Code From Similar Projects							
		**************************************	% of Modifi						
	Project	# of DSLOC	Design	Code	Integration				
			· %	%	%				
	-		···	%	<u>~</u> %				
			%	%	, io				
9. Do	cumentation								
Do	cument title								
CP	CI Development Specificati	OB			. .				
CP	Cl Product Specification				-				
Те	st Plan								
Te	st Procedures								
7 e	st Report								
Us	er's Manual								
Oh	erator's Manual								
()t	her:								
Οţ	her:								
() t	her:								

Development Phase	# of	Software	Failures/Errors
Preliminary Design(Contract Award to	PDR)		
Detailed Design(PDR to CDR)			···
Code & Debug(CDR to Test & Integ Star	t)		
Test & Integration(T & I Start to FQT	`)		
<pre>System Test/IOC(FQT to Contract End)</pre>			
Other Factors or Characteristics:			

The second seconds of the second seconds and seconds are seconds and seconds and seconds and seconds are seconds are seconds and seconds are seconds a

COMPUTER PROGRAM CONFIGURATION ITEM SUMMARY DATA FORM INSTRUCTIONS

- Item 1: Enter the name of the CPCI for which this form is being prepared.
- Item 2: Enter a brief description of the major functions performed by this CPCI.
- Item 3.1: Enter the original schedule date for each applicable milestone (enter N/A if a milestone is not applicable). If the milestones are not established for this project, use the schedule data for equivalent activities to complete this item. Formal milestone definitions are included in Attachment A. Unless otherwise indicated, the date should reflect the activity completion date. Where available, enter the actual date of completion for the milestone; for ongoing efforts, enter the current estimate for completion of the milestone.
- Item 3.2: Indicate with an X the degree of schedule acceleration or stretchout that the original schedule dates in Item 3.1 represent relative to the normal time required to develop this CPCI. For example, if the specified schedule is 24 months and the normal development time is estimated at 30 months, the schedule acceleration/stretchout is 80%.
- Item 4.1: For each of the five areas listed, indicate the average experience at the start of this project of the development personnel working on this CPCI. Item 4.1A refers to experience with other projects having similar functions and interfaces. Item 4.1B refers to experience with the develop ment tools and methods used on this CPCI. Item 4.1C refers to experience with the programming languages used on

this CPCI. Item 4.1D refers to experience with the development and target computer hardware, operating systems and architecture. Item 4.1E refers to experience with the support software and automated development tools, e.g., program design languages, debuggers, etc., used in the development of this CPCI.

Item 4.2: Indicate with an X the capability of the analysts and programmers who are working on this CPCI in terms of percentiles with respect to the overall industry population of programmers/designers. This rating should be based on aptitude for programming/designing software, efficiency and thoroughness, and ability to communicate and cooperate. This rating should reflect the capability of the personnel as a team rather than individuals.

Item 4.3: Indicate as a percentage the degree to which manpower loading levels are constrained by personnel availability or budget limitations. An entry of 85% indicates that the attainable manpower loading was 15% less than the required level. If there are no manloading constraints, enter 100%.

Item 4.4: For completed developments enter the peak manloading level, i.e., the largest number of software engineers and programmers at a point in time, attained during the development of this CPCI. For ongoing developments enter the current estimate of the maximum manloading required.

Item 5: Indicate with an X the level of reliability required for this CPCI using the following impact criteria:

Very Low = The impact of a software failure is simply the inconvenience caused by the requirement to fix the software. Typical examples are a demonstration prototype of a voice typewriter or an early feasibility phase software simulation model.

Low = The effect of the failure is a small, easily recoverable loss to the users. Typical examples are a long range planning model or a climate forecasting system.

Nominal = The effect of software failure is a moderate loss to users, but a situation from which one can recover without extreme penalty. Typical examples are management information systems or inventory control systems.

High = The effect of the software failure can be a major financial loss or a massive human inconvenience. Typical examples are banking systems and electric power distribution systems.

Very High = The effect of software failure can be the loss of human life. Examples are military command and control systems or nuclear reactor control systems.

Item 6: Indicate with an X the level of complexity of this CPCI using the criteria in Table B-1 by matching the characteristics for each type of processing performed by this CPCI.

Item 7: Indicate with an X the degree of precision in the development specification using the following criteria:

Very precise = No additional analysis is needed to develop detail design

Precise = Only minor details must be worked out to develop detail design

Imprecise = Significant additional analysis
is required to develop detail design.

Item 8.1: Enter the total deliverable lines of source code for this CPCI. Do not include lines which are entirely documentation, such as, comments or source instructions from unmodified utility software. This line count should include job control language instructions, format statements, and data declarations as well as logic control instructions.

TABLE B-1
SOFTWARE COMPLEXITY CRITERIA

TYPE RATING	CONTROL OPERATIONS	COMPUTATIONAL OPERATIONS	DEVICE-DEPENDENT OPERATIONS	DATA MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS
Very low	Sequenced code with a few non-nested SP operators: DOs CASEs,IFTHEN-ELSEs. Simple predicates	Evaluation of simple expressions, e.g. A=B+C*(D-E)	Simple read, write state- ments with simple formats	Simple arrays in main memory
Low	Straightforward nesting of SP operators. Mostly single predicates	Evaluation of moderate level expressions e.g., D=SQRT (B**2-4.*A*C)	No cognizance needed of particular processor or I/O device characteristics. I/O done at GET/PUT level, no cognizance of overlap	Single file subsetting with no data structure changes, no data edits, no intermediate files
Nominal	Mostly simple nesting. Some intermodule control. Decision tables	Use of standard math and sta- tistical rou- tines. Basic matrix and vector oper- ations	1/0 processing includes de- vice selection Status check- ing and error processing	Multiple input and single file output. Simple structural changes simple edits
High	Highly nested SP operators with many compound predicates. Queue and stack control. Considerable intermodule control	Basic numerical analysis: multivariate interpolation, ordinary differential equations. Basic truncation roundoff concerns	Operations at physical I/O level(physical storage address translations, seeks, reads, etc.) Optimized I/O overlap	Special purpose subroutines activated by data stream contents. Complex data restructuring at record level

TABLE B-1
SOFTWARE COMPLEXITY CRITERIA (Continued)

TYPE RATING	CONTROL OPERATIONS	COMPUTATIONAL OPERATIONS	DEVICE-DEPENDENT OPERATIONS	DATA MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS
Very High	Reentrant and recursive cod-ing. Fixed-priority interrupt handling	Difficult but structured numerical analysis: near-singular matrix equations, partial differential equations		Generalized parameter- driven file structuring routine. File building, com- mand processing, search optimization
Extra High	Multiple re- source sched- uling with dynamically changing priorities. Microcode level control	Difficult and unstructured numerical analysis: highly accurate analysis of noisy stochastic data	Device timing-dependent coding, microprogrammed operations	Highly coupled, dynamic rela- tional struc- tures. Natural language data management

Item 8.2: Enter the total lines of source code documentation delivered with the source code for this CPCI.

 $\underline{\text{Item 8.3}}$: Enter the size of the data base to be developed with this CPCI and delivered as part of the system in bytes.

Item 8.4: Enter the percent of the deliverable lines of source code that performs each of the categories of operation defined below:

Data Storage and Retrieval - Operation of data storage devices, data base management, secondary storage handling, data blocking and deblocking, hashing techniques. Primarily hardware oriented code.

On-line Communications - Including machine-to-machine communications with queuing allowed. Timing restrictions not as severe as with real-time command and control.

Real-time Command and Control - Machine-to-machine communications under tight timing constraints. Queuing not practicable. Heavy hardware interface. Strict protocol requirements.

Interactive Operations - Real-time man/machine interfaces. Human engineering considerations and error protection are very important.

Mathematical Operations - Routine mathematical applications with no overriding constraints.

String Manipulation - Routine applications with no overriding constraints. Not oriented towards mathematics. Typified by language compilers, sorting, formatting, buffer manipulation, etc.

Operating Systems - Task management. Memory management. Heavy hardware interface. Many interactions. High reliability and strict timing requirements.

Other - Specifically identify any unique operations not included in the above categories.

Item 8.5: Indicate with an X the response mode required in the operational system using the following guidelines:

Real-time - The software must complete processing in response to an event prior to the occurrence of the next event. Arrival of the data and the occurrence of events is not under the control of the software and extra effort in the design, test and implementation of the software is required to satisfy time and processing requirements.

On-line - Software in this category must respond within a human compatible time frame, usually within a few seconds. Also requires additional development effort, but not the extra level required for real-time software.

Time-constrained - Software in this category must complete processing within a specified time frame which is not as restrictive as real-time or on-line requirements. Time lines are in the order of minutes or hours; sometimes a clock time is specified for completion of processing.

Non-time Critical - There is no time constraint for completion of processing for this category of software.

Item 8.6: Enter the percentage of the delivered lines of source code for this CPCI for each of the statement types listed using the following guidelines:

Logical - statements which control the execution sequences in the program and include constructs such as IF-THEN-ELSE, DO WHILE, DO UNTIL, CASE, GO TO or CALL.

Command - statements which direct the system software to perform specific functions or to create the environment required to support the software. These statements are generally written in a language specific to the computer hardware.

Mathematical - statements which perform computations. This category includes coded equations for algorithms, vector algebra, modeling, index computation, etc.

Data Manipulation - statements which perform input and output, as well as the storage, movement and modification of data. Format statements are also included.

Data Declaration - statements which are non-executable and define the characteristics and values of the data contained in the program.

<u>ltem 8.7</u>: Indicate with an X the level of display interaction required for the user interface with this CPCI using the following guidelines:

Simple Input/Output - No special considerations or requirements implemented to enhance user interface.

User Friendly - Special display formatting, e.g., menus, with extensive diagnostic and input or processing error handling capabilities.

Interactive - Advanced features such as light pen or touch-sensitive displays for user interface.

Complex Requirements/Severe Impact - Two dimensional projection of solid figures, hidden line processing in line-of-sight projections, earth projections from space for weather prediction and resource mapping and integrated circuit layout.

Item 8.8: Identify the programming languages in which this CPCI is written and indicate the percentage of the delivered source lines coded in the language.

Item 8.9: Identify any previously developed code which has been adapted for this CPCI. Include the name of the project for which the code was developed and the number of delivered source lines of code (DSLOC) which were adapted. Enter the percentage of the original design which was modified and the percentage of code which was rewritten. Finally, indicate the approximate percentage of effort required to integrate and test the adapted software compared to the normal amount required for a new development of a comparable size and difficulty.

Item 9: Enter the page count for each document listed and specify any additional documentation required for this CPCI. Indicate with an X in the appropriate column whether the page count is estimated or actual.

Item 10: Enter the number of software failures, design errors and coding errors discovered during each of the five development phases.

Item 11: Describe any other factors or characteristics of this CPCI and the development environment which affected the number of delivered source lines of code or the resources expended in the development of this CPCI. Identify any features of this development which make it unique relative to other developments.

RESOURCE EXPENDITURE DATA

2. Latest Month of Actuals:	3. Units of Manpower:		
WBS ELEMENT			
OR CPCI			
MONTHS			
AFTER		i O	
CONTRACT AWARD			
1			
2	- +		
3		1	,
4	1		
5			
6			
7		!	
8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
9			
10	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
11			
12			
13			
14		ſ	
15		i	
16	1		
17			
18			
19		i	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

WBS ELEM/CPCI					
MAC					
26					
27				-	
28					
29			·		
30			•		
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37		·			
38		,			
39					
40		·			
41					
42		 	 		
43		·			
44					
45					
46					
4.7		:			
48					
49			_		
50		•			
51		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
52					
53		• — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —			
54					
5.5		•			
56	1				
57		• — • - •	······································		
58		•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
59					
60					
50	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			

RESOURCE EXPENDITURE DATA FORM INSTRUCTIONS

This form is designed to collect time-phased manpower data for the software development project at the lowest level of detail available. Attach a copy of the cost/work breakdown structure used to collect manpower data for software activities on this contract/development project.

Item 1: Enter the project name.

Item 2: Enter the latest month after contract award or project start for which actual manpower data is available. This number should reflect the months after the date for contract award entered in Item 6 for the contract award milestone on the Software Development Project Summary Data Form.

Item 3: Enter the units of measure used for the manpower figures, that is, manhours, mandays, manmonths or manyears. Indicate the number of hours that the unit is based on, if you are not entering manhours.

In the top row of the table enter the name of the cost/work breakdown structure element or computer program configuration item for which you have manpower data. Include any of the software related work breakdown structure elements in Attachment B for which you have data. In each of the subsequent rows enter the manpower expended during the month after contract award indicated in the left hand column. Space is provided for up to five years of data. For ongoing projects enter the latest estimate of resource requirements for those months for which actual data is not available.

COMPUTER PROGRAM CONFIGURATION ITEM FUNCTION AND SIZING DATA DETAIL

CPCI NAME:


PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE	
ING # OF WORDS	
# OF DISLOC #	,
FUNCTION	
NEM CODE	
WODIEICATION EXTENSIVE REUSED CODE	
MODIFICATION REUSED CODE	
MODULE OR UNIT NAME	
CPC NAME	

COMPUTER PROGRAM CONFIGURATION ITEM FUNCTION AND SIZING DATA DETAIL FORM INSTRUCTIONS

Enter the name of the CPCI for which the information is being furnished in the space provided. For each module or unit in the CPCI, identify computer component to which it belongs, the function index number from Table B-2, the module size in delivered source lines of code and number of main memory words occupied, and the programming language used. Likewise, indicate with an X in the appropriate column whether the code is reused code with little or no modification, reused code with extensive modification, or entirely new code. If information is not available at the module or unit level, provide it at the next highest level available, i.e., CPC level. If the CPCI does not use all of the intermediate levels, leave the unused column blank. In the event that none of the functions in Table B-2 adequately describes a particular CPC1 element, enter a brief statement of the element function in the appropriate column.

TABLE B-2
SOFTWARE FUNCTION CATEGORIES

ТҮРЕ	CATEGORY	INDEX	FUNCTION
Operational	Displays	1.1	Avionics
	t	1.2	Command, Control, Communications
		1.3	Other
	Avionics	2.1	Mission Planning
		2.2	Navigation
		2.3	Aircraft Steering & Flight Control
	· ·	2.4	Sighting, Designation & Location Determination
		2.5	: Weapon Delivery
		2.6	Electronic Countermeasures
		2.7	Other
	Command, Control, & Communications	3.1	Network Monitoring
		3.2	Network Control & Switching
		3.3	Sensor Control
		3.4	Signal Processing
	i e	3.5	Message Processing
	ļ	3.6	Message Distribution
		3.7	Message Logging & Retrieval
		3.8	Data Reduction
		3.9	Other
	Executive	4.1	Computer Resource Management
		4.2	Computer Operator Interface
		4.3	Other Terminal Operator Interface
		4.4	Special Device Interface
		4.5	Other Input or Satput
		4.6	Error Haudling Records: Recovery
		4.7	Multicomputer
		4.8	Performance (1)
			+ * * * * ±






TABLE B-2
SOFTWARE FUNCTION CATEGORIES (Continued)

ТҮРЕ	CATEGORY	INDEX	FUNCTION
Operational (Continued)	Data Base	5.1 5.2 5.3	On-Line Retrieval & Output On-Line Initialization & Updating Other
	Training	6.1 6.2 6.3	Control of Exercise Sequencing Operator Performance Data Collection Other
	On-Line Equipment Diagnostic	7.1 7.2 7.3 7.4 7.5 7.6 7.7 7.8	System Readiness Test Computer Diagnostic Memory Diagnostic Display Diagnostic Switch/Indicator Panel Diagnostic 1/0 Diagnostic Mode Diagnostic Other
Support	Operating System	8.1 8.2 8.3 8.4 8.5 8.6	Computer Resource Management Computer Operator Interface Terminal Operator Interface Input or Output Error Handling/Reconfiguration/ Recovery Performance Monitoring & Data Collection Other
	Equipment Maintenance	9.1	Off-Line Computer Diagnostics Other

TABLE B-2
SOFTWARE FUNCTION CATEGORIES (Continued)

Туре	Category	Index	Function
Support (Continued)	Software Development	10.1	Higher Order Language Compiler
		10.2	Assembler
		10.3	Debugger
		10.4	Loader or Editor
		10.5	Other
	Off-Line	11.1	Data Base Definition
	Data Base Management	11.2	Data Base Initialization or Updating
	пападешенс	11.3	Retrieval & Output Formatting
		11.4	Data Base Restructuring
		11.5	Off-Line Data Base
		11.6	Other
	Design	12.1	Data Base Design
	!	12.2	Data Base Processor Design
	i	12.3	Performance Simulation
	1	12.4	Data Reduction
	: !	12.5	Data Analysis
		12.6	Other
	Test Software	13.1	Test Case Generation
		13.2	Test Case Data Recording
		13.3	Test Data Reduction
		13.4	Test Analysis
		13.5	Other
	Utilities	14.1	Media Conversions
1	1 	14.2	Format Translation
		14.3	Sort/Merge
		14.4	Program Library Maintenance
	i 	14.5	Other

TABLE B-2
SOFTWARE FUNCTION CATEGORIES (Continued)

ТҮРЕ	CATEGORY	INDEX	FUNCTION
Support (Continued)	Off-Line Training	15.1 15.2 15.3 15.4	Data Reduction Training Analysis Scenario Preparation Other
	Project Management	16.1 16.2 16.3 16.4 16.5 16.6 16.7 16.8	Project Event Status Accounting Schedule Maintenance/Projection Financial Accounting Software Cost Reporting Hardware Cost Reporting Software Cost Prediction Hardware Cost Prediction Other
	Hardware Subsystem Simulations	17.1 17.2 17.3	Interfacing Hardware Simulations Environmental Simulations Operator Action Simulations Other

ATTACHMENT A GLOSSARY

<u>Application software</u> - software that implements the operational capabilities of a system.

Assessment - a qualitative evaluation.

<u>Compiler</u> - a computer program that accepts a source program expressed in a higher order language as input, and produces either a machine code or assembly language representation of the source program as output.

<u>Code walk-through</u> - a step-by-step, detailed examination of source code by a small group of qualified personnel. Sometimes it is referred to as a peer review.

Computer data - basic elements of information used by the computer hardware in responding to a computer program.

Computer program - a series of instructions or statements in a form acceptable to an electronic computer designed to cause the computer to execute an operation or a series of operations.

<u>Computer software</u> - a combination of associated programs and computer program data definitions required to enable the computer hardware to perform computational or control functions. Note: this definition includes firmware.

Computer program component (CPC) - a design component of the computer program design architecture made up of units and modules implementing requirements of a computer program configuration item (CPCI).

<u>Computer program configuration item (CPCI)</u> - an aggregation of computer software which satisfies an end use function and is designated for configuration management.

<u>Contractor</u> - any organization under contract or tasking agreement with a procuring agency to perform any part of a software development effort.

<u>Critical Design Review (CDR)</u> - a review conducted for each configuration item when the detail design is essentially complete to determine if the detail design satisfies the requirements

established in the specification and to establish the exact interface relationships with other parts of the system.

<u>Defense system</u> - a system which contributes directly to the combat capability of the Department of Defense.

<u>Demonstration</u> - a qualification method which relies on observable operation to establish that a requirement has or has not been met.

Design walk-through - a step-by-step detailed examination of the design of the software by a small group of qualified personnel.

Development baseline - the initial approved technical documentation which defines the configuration of a CPCI during the Full-Scale Development Phase and which prescribes (1) all design characteristics of the CPCI and (2) the selected functional characteristics of the CPCI designated for software performance testing. The Developmental Baseline is under the development contractor's configuration control.

Documentation - the comprehensive written description of computer software in various formats and levels of detail that clearly define its content, composition, design, performance, testing, and use.

Embedded computer software - software which executes on computers which are (1) incorporated as integral parts, (2) dedicated to or required for the direct support of, or (3) required to upgrade or modify defense systems.

<u>Firmware</u> - microcode (software) which resides in computer memory that is not alterable by the computer system during program execution.

Formal Qualification Test (FQT) - a formal test conducted in accordance with approved test plans, descriptions, and procedures after a CPCI has been integrated to validate that each function of the CPCI satisfies specified software requirements and applicable interface requirements.

Formal test - a test which is conducted in accordance with test procedures approved by the procuring activity, is witnessed by an authorized representative, and is documented in a test report for procuring agency review.

Functional Configuration Audit (FCA) - the formal examination of functional characteristics test data for a configuration item to verify that the item has achieved the performance specified in its functional or allocated configuration identification.

<u>Higher order language</u> - a primarily machine independent language (of a higher order than assembly language) designed for ease of expression of a class of problems or procedures by humans.

<u>Inspection</u> - a qualification method which relies on visual examination to establish that a requirement has or has not been met.

Measurement - quantitative evaluation.

Modular - a software design characteristic which organizes the software into limited aggregates of data and contiguous code that perform complete functions and are, therefore, completely understandable by themselves.

<u>Module</u> - a discrete, identifiable set of instructions which are treated as an entity by the computer's operating system, and which can be executed and tested on a stand-alone basis. Equivalent to a unit.

Physical Configuration Audit (PCA) - the formal examination of the "as-coded" configuration of a CPCI against its technical documentation in order to establish the initial product configuration identification.

<u>Precompiler</u> - a computer program which converts programming statements which are unacceptable to the compiler into statements with acceptable syntax.

Preliminary Design Review (PDR) - a review prior to the start of the detail design process to evaluate progress and technical adequacy of the selected design approach, to determine the design compatibility with the performance requirements of the CPCI development specification, and to establish the existence and compatibility of the interfaces between the configuration item and other elements of the system.

Preliminary Qualification Test (PQT) - a test conducted during the integration of a CPCI to evaluate the performance of those CPCI functions which are critical, as determined by time-critical or performance-critical requirements. A PQT may be either formal or informal.

Product baseline - the final approved technical documentation which defines the configuration of a CPCI at the completion of software performance testing at the point where the CPCI is integrated into the system. The product baseline includes final versions of all specifications and documents from preceding baselines.

<u>Program design language</u> - a design tool used to facilitate the translation of system functional requirements into the elements of a program design hierarchy.

Program support library - a repository for programs and data used to facilitate the orderly development of software. The repository provides two fundamental capabilities: (1) programs and data are stored in machine readable form for computer operation and the identical information is stored in hard copy form for human comprehension, and (2) the repository contains all management data pertinent to the software development project.

Software development - the engineering process and effort that results in software, encompassing the span of time from initiation of the contracted effort through delivery to and acceptance by the procuring agency.

Software error - an occurrence, or lack thereof, during the execution of a program and attributable to the software that prevents satisfaction of the specified software requirements, fails to perform as designed, or performs a function not required and not desired.

<u>Support software</u> - all software used to aid the development, testing and support of applications, systems, test and maintenance, and trainer software.

se significant processes to coccess to coccess to consider the construction of the coccess to consider the coccess to construct the construct the coccess to construct the construction that construct the construction the construction that construct the construction that construction the constructi

Systems software - software that is used to maximize the use of computer resources at the time of use. Operating systems, executives, and data base management systems are examples of this type of software.

System Design Review (SDR) - a review conducted when the definition effort has proceeded to the point where system requirements and the design approach are more precisely defined. The review ensures that there is a technical understanding between the contractor and the procuring agency on the system segments identified in the system specification and the configuration items identified in the CI performance specifications.

System Requirements Review (SRR) - a review conducted when a significant portion of the system functional requirements have been established to determine the adequacy of the contractor's efforts in defining system requirements.

Test - a qualification method which relies on operation in an actual or simulated environment and subsequent analysis of data obtained during operation to establish that a requirement has or has not been met.

Top-down design - a design method in which operations are defined in a hierarchical manner from the more general to the more precise. Top-level operations are defined in relatively general terms. Operations on all levels except the bottom one are defined more precisely in terms of operations on the level immediately below.

<u>Top-down programming</u> - the implementation of code and data in a sequence which proceeds from the top level of design to the bottom level, continuously exercising the actual interfaces between program elements.

Unit - the lowest level logical entity specified in the detailed design which completely describes a non-divisible function in sufficient detail to allow implementing code to be produced, assembled or compiled, and tested independently of other units. Equivalent to a module.

Validation of computer software - the evaluation, integration, and test activities carried out at the system level to ensure that the finally developed system satisfies the user's requirements set down as performance and design criteria for the system.

<u>Verification of computer software</u> - the interactive process of determining whether the product of each step of the software development process fulfills all requirements levied by the previous step.

<u>Virtual machine</u> - the complex of hardware and software that the software being developed calls upon to accomplish its tasks.

ATTACHMENT B SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

The following is an illustration of a recommended work breakdown structure for a project with both hardware and software elements.

LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
Defense	System		
	Prime Missio	n Equipment	
		Integrat	ion and Assembly
		Hardware	Subsystem or End Item 1
		_	
		-	
		_	
		Hardware	Subsystem or End Item n
"		Software	Subsystem 1
			Subsystem Analysis & Design
			Subsystem Integration & Test
			Computer Program Configuration Item 1
			_
			_
			Computer Program Configuration Item n
			_
			_
			-
		Software	Subsystem n

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
		Support S	oftware
			Computer Program Configuration Item 1
			_
			_
			Computer Program Configuration Item n
	Training		
		Equipment	
		Services	
		Facilitie	s
	Peculiar S	upport Equipme	nt
		Organizat	ional
		Intermedi	ate
[Depot	
	System Tes	t & Evaluation	
		Developme	nt Test & Evaluation
		Operation	al Test & Evaluation
		Mockups	
		Test & Ev	aluation Support
		Test Faci	lities
	System/Pro	gram Managemer	t
		Systems E	ngineering
		Project N	anagement
	Data		
		Technical	Publications
		Engineeri	
		Managemer	t Data
		Support [
		Data Depo	sitory

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
	Operational/Site Activation				
		Contract	tor Technical Support		
		Site			
		Construc	ction		
		Site/Shi	ip/Vehicle Conversion		
		System A	Assembly Installation &		
		Checkout	t on Site		
	Common Sup	port Equipmen	nt		
		Organiza	ational		
		Intermed	diate		
		Depot			
Industrial Facilities					
		Construc	ction/Conversion/Expansion		
		Equipmen	nt Acquisition or Modernization		
		Maintena	ance		
	Initial Sp	oares & Initia	al Repair Parts		

REFERENCES

- 1. Boehm, B.W., "Software Engineering," <u>IEEE Transactions</u> on Computers, Volume C-25, Number 12, December 1976, p. 1227.
- 2. "SLIM System Description," Quantitative Software Management, Inc.
- 3. "JS-1 Schedule and Cost Estimation System User's Manual," Computer Economics, Inc., 1981.
- 4. "PRICE Software Model User's Manual," RCA Corporation.
- 5. Boehm, B.W., <u>Software Engineering Economics</u>, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1981.
- 6. Dumas, R.L., "Final Report: Software Acquisition Resource Expenditure(SARE) Data Collection Methodology," The MITRE Corporation, Report Number MTR-9031, December 1983.
- 7. Apgar, H., "Software Standard Module Estimating," Bunker Ramo Electronic Systems, 1982.
- 8. Clapp, J.A., "A Review of Software Cost Estimation Methods," The MITRE Corporation, Report Number MTR-3264, August 1976.
- 9. Aron, J.D., "Estimating Resources for Large Programming Systems," Software Engineering: Concepts and <u>Techniques</u>, edited by J.M. Buxton et al, Litton Educational Publishing, Inc., 1976.
- Walston, C.E. and Felix, C.P., "A Method of Programming Measurement and Estimation," <u>IBM Systems Journal</u>, Vol. 16, No. 1, 1977.
- 11. Putnam, L.H., "A General Empirical Solution to the Macro Software Sizing and Estimating Problem," <u>IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering</u>, Vol. SE-4, No. 4, July 1978.
- 12. Herd, J.R., et al., "Software Cost Estimation Study: Study Results," Doty Associates, Inc.. Report Number RADC-TR-77-220, Vol. I, June 1977 AD A042264
- Thibodeau, R., "An Evaluation of Software Cost Estimating Models," General Research Corporation, Report Number RADC-TR-81-144, June 1981 AD A104226

REFERENCES (Continued)

- 14. Wolverton, R.W., "The Cost of Developing Large-Scale Software," <u>IEEE Transactions on Computers</u>, June 1974.
- 15. Chrysler, E., "Some Basic Determinants of Computer Programming Productivity," Communications of the ACM, Vol. 21, No. 6, June 1978.
- 16. Sunohara, T., et al., "Program Complexity Measure for Software Development Management," Proc., Fifth International Conference for Software Development Management, IEEE, March 1981, pp. 100-106.
- 17. Boehm, B.W., et. al., <u>Characteristics of Software Quality</u>, North-Holland Publishing Co., New York, 1978.
- Musa, J.D., "The Measurement and Management of Software Reliability," <u>Proc. of the IEEE</u>, Vol. 68, No. 9, September 1980.
- 19. McCabe, T.J., "A Complexity Measure," <u>IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering</u>, Vol. SE-2, No. 4, 1976, pp. 308-320.
- 20. Musa, J.D., "Software Reliability Measurement," <u>The Journal of Systems and Software 1</u>, Elvesier North Holland, Inc., New York, 1980.
- 21. Halstead, M.H., <u>Elements of Software Science</u>, Elvesier North Holland, Inc., New York, 1977.
- 22. Mathis, N.S. and Willmorth, N.E., "Software Milestone Measurement Study," Naval Electronics Laboratory Center, Report Number NELC-TD-285, November 1973.
- 23. Brown, J.R., "Impact of MPP on Software Development,"
 TRW Defense and Space Systems Group, Report Number RADCTR-77-121, May 1977 AD A040467
- 24. Gilb, T., <u>Software Metrics</u>, Winthrop Publishers, Cambridge, 1977.
- 25. "Work Breakdown Structures for Defense Materiel Items (MIL-STD-881A)," Department of Defense, 25 April 1975.

REFERENCES (Continued)

- 26. Tausworthe, R.C., "The Work Breakdown Structure in Software Project Management," The Journal of Systems and Software I, Elvesier North Holland, Inc., 1980, pp. 181-186.
- 27. "Standard Cost Breakdown Structure," National Security Agency, Draft NSA/CSS Circular (Unnumbered), 1983.
- 28. Wheaton, M.J., "Software Sizing Task Final Report," The Aerospace Corporation, Technical Memorandum Number ATM-84(45-2303)-1, October 1983.
- 29. "Proposed Military Standard on Defense System Software Development (MIL-STD-SDS)," Joint Logistics Commanders, 15 April 1982.
- 30. "Configuration Management Practices for Systems, Equipment, Munitions, and Computer Programs (MIL-STD-483)," Department of Defense.
- 31. "Weapon System Software Development (MIL-STD-1679A)," Department of Defense.
- 32. "Specification Practices (MIL-STD-490)," Department of Defense.
- 33. "Technical Reviews and Audits for Systems, Equipment Munitions, and Computer Programs (MIL-STD-1521A)," Department of Defense.
- 34. "Proposed Revisions to Data Item Descriptons," Joint Logistics Commanders, Working Papers, 5 December 1983.
- 35. Najberg, A.C., "Software Data Base Development Preliminary Report," The Analytic Sciences Corporation, Report Number TIM-4612-5-1, 9 March 1984.

END JA N. 1988 DTIC